DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 271 248 RC 015 784

AUTHOR Johnson, Kenneth F.; And Others
TITLE Wichita's Hispanics: Tensions, Concerns, and the Migrant Stream.
INSTITUTION Wichita State Univ., Kans.
PUB DATE Jun 85
NOTE 234p.; Funds to support this research were provided by the Faculty Research Committee at Wichita State University.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - General (020) -- Historical Materials (060) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Attitudes; Cultural Background; Educational Needs; Ethnic Studies; *Hispanic Americans; Law Enforcement; Local History; *Local Issues; Medical Services; Mexican Americans; Migration Patterns; Minority Groups; Political Issues; Public Policy; *Quality of Life; Refugees; Social Problems; *Socioeconomic Influences; Spanish Speaking; Undocumented Immigrants
IDENTIFIERS *Impact Studies; *Kansas (Wichita)

ABSTRACT

In an attempt to formulate a set of testable propositions about the dynamics of Hispanic life that will be valuable pedagogically and as a basis for public policy formation, this study assesses the impact of Hispanic Americans on Wichita, Kansas. Chapter 1 identifies the Hispanic origins of Kansas' 63,339 Hispanics who represent 2.7% of the state's population and presents vignettes describing conditions of minorities/Hispanics on the Great Plains in the three decades following World War I. Chapter 2 traces the Hispanic thrust into Kansas in the 1920s, discussing Anglo mental syndromes especially about Mexican workers, urban clustering, and the railroad influence. Chapter 3 addresses the public relationships, policy questions and illegal alien issues of today's Wichita Hispanic community of 9,902 persons emphasizing relationships with law enforcement agencies, medical services, and educational needs. Chapter 4 presents social and attitudinal profiles of 31 prominent Wichita Hispanics compiled from their responses to a questionnaire. Chapter 5 offers some preliminary conclusions on the continuing Hispanic immigration into Wichita and the impact of clandestine Mexican migrants and includes commentaries on the study from local observers. An appendix contains notes on Central American refugees and the sanctuary movement. (NEC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

JAN 1986
RECEIVED
ERIC/CRESS

WICHITA'S HISPANICS:

Tensions, Concerns, and the Migrant Stream

ED271248

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Kenneth F. Johnson
Wichita State University
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

RC015784

Wichita State University

June, 1985

WICHITA'S HISPANICS: TENSIONS, CONCERNS, AND THE MIGRANT STREAM

by

Kenneth F. Johnson*
Department of Political Science
Wichita State University

in consultation with

John J. Hartman, Department of Sociology

and

James W. McKenney, Department of Political Science

(both of Wichita State University)

and including contributions by

Phil Alldritt, Kim Allen, Sherri Bayouth,
Donna Burger, and Kimberly Johnston, all student researchers at

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

*The principal author is Professor of Political Science at the University of Missouri-St. Louis, on leave during 1984-1986, doing research on migrant Hispanic impact on the Great Plains. This is a preliminary report inviting constructive criticism and laying a basis for continued inquiry. No publication or reproduction may be made without the author's written permission. Funds to support this research were provided by the Faculty Research Committee of Wichita State University. Professor Johnson remains exclusively liable for accuracy of content and validity of judgments expressed herein.

CONTENTS

Foreword ii

Prologue (by Richard Noriega) iv

Chapter One. Hispanic America on the Great Plains 1

Introduction 1
(TABLE A: HISPANIC POPULATIONS OF SELECTED U.S. STATES 5
On Proving One's Valor: Quality of Life Vignettes-Glimpses 13
On the Condition of Minorities-Hispanics on the Great Plains 24
Footnotes 31-32

Chapter Two. Migration and Cultural Footholds in Kansas 33

Tracing the Hispanic Thrust into Kansas 35
Western Kansas in the 1920s: Anglo Mental Syndromes and Early Hispanic Life 41
Hispanic Migration into Eastern Kansas: Urban Clustering and the Railroad Influence 53
(TABLE B: PERSONS OF MEXICAN ORIGIN IN SELECTED KANSAS COMMUNITIES) 59
Footnotes 73

Chapter Three. Today's Hispanic Community in Wichita: Public Relationships, Policy Questions, and the Illegal Alien Issue 76

Hispanics and Law Enforcement Agencies 76
Medical Services for Wichita's Hispanic Needy 109
Educational Needs of the Spanish-Speaking Community 125
(TABLE C: WICHITA PUBLIC SCHOOLS BILINGUAL EDUCATIONAL BUDGET) 128
Concluding Observations 133
Footnotes 136

Chapter Four. Prominent Wichita Hispanics: A Social and Attitudinal Profile) 141

Introduction 141
Presentation of Data and Analysis 143-156
Summary and Discussion 157
(TABLE D: PROMINENT WICHITA HISPANICS-A SOCIAL AND ATTITUDINAL PROFILE) 164
Footnotes 174

Chapter Five. Impact and Integration: Some Preliminary Conclusions on the Continuing Hispanic Immigration into Wichita, Kansas 175

On the Impact of Clandestine Mexican Migrants 175
Commentaries on this Study from Local Observers 188
Conclusions 195
Footnotes 205

Epilogue (by Tom L. Page) 207

Appendix A: A Note on Central American Refugees and the Sanctuary Movement 210

FOREWORD

Preparation of this research report benefited from the support of Wichita State University and the collaboration of the United Methodist Urban (Hispanic) Ministries of Wichita, Kansas. The inquiry began in January, 1984 and is considered ongoing. Most of the persons who contributed generously and importantly to this undertaking have been cited in the text. In its initial stages the project was guided by an advisory committee composed of Maria Balderas, Josephine Clevenger, Al Hernandez, Victor Montemayor, Richard Noriega, and Martha Sanchez. At one point or another these people have been recognized for their important contributions and insights in the pages to follow. I have also benefitted from the counsel of my colleagues James McKenney, John Hartman, Bernice Hutcherson, and Nancy Brooks here at Wichita State University and from the encouragement and support of Dean Martin Reif plus the help of those students cited on the title page. Each of them made significant contributions to this project. Other members of the WSU academic community are recognized appropriately throughout the typescript.

In addition I wish to thank George Doyle of Radio Station KFH, the Reverend James Bell of the Inter-Faith Ministries of Wichita, George Neavoll of the Wichita Eagle-Beacon, the Reverend Martin Holler of the United Methodist Urban Ministries, and Richard Lopez of the SER Corporation for sharing their wisdom with me.

I am especially grateful to the Nájera-Galván family of Wichita for allowing me to write their migratory family profile. Sergio Tristán assisted importantly in gaining access to Spanish-speaking respondents and the Reverend Charles Chipman has kindly allowed much of the interviewing for this project to take place in St. Paul's United Methodist Church in Wichita. Sister Judy Stephens and Mary Kay Mayer of the Manna House of Prayer at Concordia, Kansas have also given highly valued testimony and criticism.

It is fair to say that without the original foresight and inspiration of James McKenney, John Hartman, and David Farnsworth (all of WSU) this project would not have gotten off the ground. Vital assistance in preparation of the manuscript was provided by Coral Smith of the WSU Department of Political Science. I am also grateful for supporting efforts by Sandra Clark and Cheryl Worthington. Nina M. Johnson provided welcome support in carrying out library research, field interviews, typing, and data collection.

Originally, my attraction to Wichita grew out of the invitation from a set of distinguished local colleagues at WSU who convinced me that the community offered an opportunity to

study a highly visible established Hispanic community, with its own distinguished local tradition, being regularly impacted by the clandestine migrant stream of economic refugees from Mexico and political refugees from Central America. On such a scale, at least, that phenomenon did not then exist in St. Louis, Mo., my usual academic base of operations. Moreover, our project in Wichita is such as to permit following the migrant stream back and forth between Kansas and Mexico. We plan, and have begun, extensive interviews in both areas.

But also, at a pleasant level of human encounter, and in the process of getting to know Wichita since January, 1984, (note: despite being a native Cornhusker of considerable vintage I had never visited Wichita before 1983) I discovered other local charms: these included many of Wichita's virtues, including first class cultural offerings, a fair and open press and broadcast media, geographic beauty, a pleasant climate year-round, clean air and clean buses, but most importantly, I found in Wichita a legion of decent caring Kansans. Given this milieu, then, it should surprise no one that many immigrants from distressed or even affluent nations (indeed from neighboring U.S. states) should elect to settle here in Wichita. The question is: how many new people can we absorb and still preserve an attractive quality of life for those who have already put down their roots and made a commitment to stay? Let us see!

Kenneth F. Johnson
Wichita State University
May, 1985

PROLOGUE*

*The writer, Richard Noriega, was born in Dodge City, Kansas of Mexican parents who migrated clandestinely to the United States. He spent part of his early life in Mexico while his family sought to make a living there. Noriega is a self-educated intellectual and writer who studies minority group relations. He makes his home in Wichita.

UNITED WE ARE NOT!

(but from diversity strength may yet be nurtured one day)

Only Mexicans will understand that there are certain things we do not discuss. Thus let me break a tradition by telling you what I have observed in our civic behavior; it reveals, indeed, that we are vulnerable to each other. The Mexican-American organizations to which I have belonged had two things in common: they hungered for social betterment; they always felt compelled to elect chairmen (not women, usually) as their spokespersons. Such organizations, at least in my experience, usually got nowhere and I always had the compelling feeling that "nothing" was our strategy.

Each of us was different albeit in the quest of common goals. The more different a member of our group the more they called him a radical, and that was "bad". Sometimes the allegiance of the followers was based more on personal feelings than on ideas. That made us vulnerable to our own emotions.

Fragmentation within our group began when the chairman issued a press release on "the Mexican condition." The chairman's view was often handed over to the press regardless of whether it truly represented the group. Then arguments began, acrimony turned into hatred. At subsequent meetings nobody remembered having given the chairman such blanket authority to speak. In-fighting continued and the chairman was either impeached or felt forced to resign. Removal of the chairman was never an accident. We were seldom united and it was hard to promote a common cause in this way!

We had great hopes in 1962. The Great Society of presidents Kennedy and Johnson was about to be born. The war against poverty was at hand. We saw others demonstrating, the American Indians, the Blacks, women, the Viet Nam war protesters. We organized ourselves in the name of Chicano power. Community action groups were incorporated and throughout the nation poor people were called to arms. The White poor, Black poor, and the Mexican poor--we stood, shoulder to shoulder, around conference tables, ready to become part of the Great Society. This was our moment of truth. It was time for the first generation of the 1916 Mexican immigrants to lead. It was time to act and we weren't prepared. We had no one to teach us, but we formed an organization as was our custom. We copied others, their by-laws, speeches, and we even tried to copy their self-confidence. From time to time someone demanded that a certain director be investigated, fired, and banished.

I was glad that we Mexicans were not the only ones who impeached the officers we elected. United we were not! Vulnerable we were--to each other!

Is it any wonder, then, that we have failed in our quest to make the American immigration process more humane? Our first generation people, more than likely, have had some experiences with the immigration service known as INS. Many of the incidents were nightmares. Our parens faced deportation, unless papers could be arranged. The INS had a bad reputation, and still has among Mexican-Americans and many other Hispanics.

Illegal emigres are breathless with anticipation after years of living in emotional catacombs; they yearn to start healing their anxieties, correct their worrisome drinking, stop having to flee in the middle of the night and get medical attention for their ulcerated bodies. Their wives and children can now look up from their underground, and live like respectable people.

Some Mexican-Americans who are U.S. citizens have been abused by over-zealous INS agents. In the spring of 1984, a dark-skinned man was in custody in a room of a North Wichita meat processing plant, along with six or eight suspected illegal Mexicans. He objected to this treatment on the grounds he was a U.S. citizen, and after about an hour of vehement exchanges, he defied the agents and walked out to his freedom. At the gate, an INS agent, gun in hand, taunted him with vulgarities about his mother. Another incident involved an illegal woman, who recently had a baby. She was employed at a Wichita hotel in June of 1984. She was a hard worker, cleaning rooms from seven in the morning until one in the afternoon. The supervisor asked a U.S.-born Mexican-American maid to clean out a restroom. She refused, saying "make that illegal one" do it. Words followed and the maid who refused was fired. But the following day she called and threatened to tell INS about the illegal maid's employment. This led to that maid also being fired (under the suddenly discovered pretext that she needed "papers" for her employment). Thus it is true, as I said earlier, that we Hispanics are not at all united, not at the basic inter-personal on-the-job level, nor publicly in the broad struggle for political power.

Meanwhile, the people of our heritage keep coming to escape the misery and injustice of their native land. The plight of the illegal Mexican immigrant is, indeed, much as it was in the thirties. They rent squalid houses. Some bathrooms have broken waterpipes. There is often exposed wiring. Some houses have been condemned by the City of Wichita. For trans-portation, illegals buy junk automobiles, and often sleep in them as well. They install transmissions during the night so they can have a way to get to work in the morning. They don't worry about valid license plates, often using "borrowed" ones

from Texas. Most avoid paperwork that might result in a linkage with the public establishment.

We know that immigration laws must be enforced. But sanctions against employers of illegal alien workers will single out the Mexican-born for selective and judgmental questioning, even harassment. Our Anglo friends will not be automatically quizzed about their citizenship. We will! Historically, what was not corrected will be re-enacted. The outcome and future of the recent immigration "reform" bill remains to be seen.

We Mexican-Americans have grown so comfortable. We have taken prosperity for granted. Suddenly we are aristocrats next to the illegals. That issue fragments and divides us perhaps more than any other, making us vulnerable to ourselves. It is difficult for me, therefore, when I see an illegal immigrant family; for therein I see my own family when I was a child. Only the calendar has changed.

Richard Noriega
Wichita, Kansas
May, 1985

CHAPTER ONE

HISPANIC AMERICA ON THE GREAT PLAINS

Introduction

Celebrating each other's ethnic differences--as opposed to undertaking strife over them--preserves the earth's naturally varied human richness, thereby making life more vibrant, colorful, and satisfying. One suspects that peaceful multiethnicity is a state that is natural to mankind. [1] Much of the Canadian experience suggests as much, that multiethnicity holds out great potential for constructive human endeavor. [2] Other experiences, like those of Northern Ireland and Lebanon, and Iran, tell us that rigid ethnicity and separatism are invitations to conflict. When cultures mix it usually involves a blending of ethnic groups through cooperative coexistence and/or miscegenation. Helping cultures to survive, even while they are undergoing symbiosis with others, is a value of major proportions.

This study has to do with cultural survival and the impact of human migration on one of America's most prominent minorities. It may be the historic mission of Hispanic peoples living among us to form a human bridge joining the dominant Anglo-European culture of the United States to the Latin culture which prevails over most of the remainder of the western hemisphere. Maintenance of that "bridge" is an impressive and sobering responsibility.

Some of the ethnic minorities in the United States contribute more to the overall cultural richness than they do to influencing public decisions and events which impinge on their own lives. A

simpler way of putting this is that Hispanics, for example, in America today lack political clout proportional to their collective numbers, although this may be changing. Recognition of political weakness led some Hispanics of a previous generation to rebel openly against the constituted socioeconomic and political systems. American society thus withstood the revolutionary onslaught of alienated social and political groups during part of the 1960s and 1970s. Some of those groups lie within the scope of the present inquiry.

Entering the fray on behalf of various Hispanic interests during those years were the Puerto Rican National Liberation Front or FPLN, Alpha 66 of the Miami Cuban colony, and Mexican-American groups like MECHA, La Raza Unida, the Brown Berets, and the Aztlán Independence Convention. The Puerto Rican and Cuban groups cited represent leftist and rightist extremes respectively and both have been associated with violence. The Mexican-American groups cited have usually been more moderate, preferring radical oratory and peaceful public demonstrations. Still other Mexican-American organizations like LULAC (League of United Latin American Citizens), the American G.I. Forum, and MALDEF (Mexican American Legal Defense Fund) have worked through the relatively conservative channels of the established political system.

At times the Mexican-Americans were victimized by those who hated racial diversity. Blind to the richness of multiethnic life, off duty sailors in Los Angeles invaded Mexican-American barrios (neighborhoods) in the 1940s and started fights leading to the notorious "Zoot Suit Riots" during which the police often

turned their backs. Some of the victimized Mexicans later came home from World War II with Distinguished Service Crosses and Purple Hearts. But the barrios continued to be places where one often protected his right to ethnic diversity by using violence in self-defense. Much later, in the summer of 1970, an anti-war march through the Mexican-American community of East Los Angeles ended in violence when marchers were needlessly attacked by police. Several persons were killed including Rubén Salazar, a respected Mexican-American journalist, whose martyrdom became a symbol for Mexican-American group attachment and for ethnic unity vis a vis the dominant culture and its Anglo-controlled institutions. Salazar "was killed when a tear gas projectile, fired into a local bar by sheriff's deputies, struck him in the head. An investigation concluded without criminal charges being filed." [3] Of this legacy one Mexican-American reminisced:

> My parents began sizing up their duty to the country, their hard work and what the returns had been...they remembered the Zoot Suit Riots...they saw police coming into our neighborhood...then there was the Salazar murder. [4]

With such antecedents it is not surprising that Mexican-Americans would entertain puzzled doubts about the virtues of multiethnicity. Perhaps, somewhere in the great Southwest, the Mexican-Americans would ultimately need to erect their own separatist community where they alone could live without threat? They could call it Aztlán after the mythical homeland of the Aztecs, a kind of "Chicano Quebec." But do Hispanics of any ethnic subgroup, or as a collectivity, have the political

wherewithall to redress grievances and promote their cause in the halls of power?

All told, Hispanics in America represent 6.4 percent of the total United States population. They do not even come close to holding a like percentage of political power overall in this country.[5] Mexican-Americans in particular feel they are under-represented. Their share of the total U.S. population, according to the 1980 census, is almost 9 million, or nearly 4 percent. Here in Kansas, out of a total state population of 2,363,679, Hispanics represent 63,339 or 2.7 percent. A breakdown of the figures for the state shows that persons of Mexican origin predominate at a total of 49,917, or 77 percent of the Hispanics in Kansas. Hispanics are also the most numerous group here in the Wichita area where our preliminary study takes place. Census figures for Sedgwick County from 1980 show a total of 11,319 persons of Hispanic origin as compared with 9,902 for the City of Wichita. An estimate in the city of Wichita by a knowledgeable Cuban-American put local membership in that ethnic group at around 100, a distinct minority out of the total.

Because the great majority of Hispanics in Kansas derive from Mexican origin we will devote most of our attention to them in the course of the present study. But we do not intend to neglect those of other ethnic origins, such as refugees from Cuba and Central America whose presence among us is felt more and more each day as this report is written. Our underlying assumption is that all of these people should be welcomed in America, if they get here, leaving us with the principal task of reconciling the

TABLE A

HISPANIC POPULATIONS OF SELECTED U.S. STATES:

FROM 1980 CENSUS

U.S.A.--Total Population	226,545,805
Total Hispanics*	14,608,673
Percent Hispanic---6.4	
Mexicans	8,740,439
Puerto Ricans	2,013,945
Cubans	803,226
Other Hispanics	3,051,063
Kansas--Total Population	2,363,679
Total Hispanics	63,339
Percent Hispanics---2.7	
Mexicans	49,917
Puerto Ricans	2,918
Cubans	926
Other Hispanics	9,578
Colorado--Total Population	2,889,964
Total Hispanics	339,717
Percent Hispanics---11.8	
Mexicans	207,204
Puerto Ricans	4,246
Cubans	1,489
Other Hispanics	126,778

* The U.S. Census incorrectly uses the expression "Spanish Origin" to characterize the above population. Taken literally this would mean people from Spain, excluding thereby nearly all persons with a Latin American origin. The present study employs the term "Hispanics" to include all persons of Spanish, Portuguese, and Latin American descent. The great majority of the persons studied herein are of Mexican origin.

TABLE A (Cont.)

Missouri--Total Population	4,916,686
Total Hispanics	51,653
Percent Hispanic---1.1	
Mexicans	32,036
Puerto Ricans	2,512
Cubans	1,507
Other Hispanics	15,598
Nebraska--Total Population	1,569,825
Total Hispanics	28,025
Percent Hispanic---1.8	
Mexicans	22,431
Puerto Ricans	627
Cubans	362
Other Hispanics	4,605
Oklahoma--Total Population	3,025,290
Total Hispanics	57,419
Percent Hispanic---1.9	
Mexicans	38,974
Puerto Ricans	2,873
Cubans	811
Other Hispanics	14,761
Texas--Total Population	14,229,191
Total Hispanics	2,982,583
Percent Hispanic---21.0	
Mexicans	2,744,550
Puerto Ricans	21,956
Cubans	13,616
Other Hispanics	202,461

varied needs they bring with prevailing U.S. policies.

Talk is usually easier than deeds. We have heard talk of Puerto Rican, Cuban, and Mexican separatism from the continental United States. Most vociferous have been the calls for creating a "Chicano Quebec." That would, presumably, mean reconstituting the American Southwest into a separate political entity, perhaps to be called Aztlán. Of course the Canadian experience would suggest that Aztlán remain within its blanket of U.S. sovereignty while enjoying special autonomies designed to serve special ethnic needs. Would such needs be those of the Chicanos only, or would all Hispanics be included?

Not all Mexican-Americans are eager for such talk to be taken seriously. On this the Chicanos are not monolithic. In point of fact, many Mexican-Americans don't even want to be called Chicanos or associated with the notion of Chicano power. A writer from New Mexico contends:

> Chicano was a curse word. In some regions of Texas and New Mexico it still is not uttered in polite society. For it means a neer-do-well, a wino, a man fallen so low that he lives on goat hill, among the goats. Some of the older people feel the word is an insult and they refuse to be called by it. [6]

Others claim for Chicanos the role of maintaining the remnants of a great culture within America's melting pot. Chicanos, they argued, emerged from a stream of forebears who

> brought with them a culture, a language, a religion and a history. They could in many cases be compared with some of those great

> civilizations that have become lost in the past. Today those civilizations are only mentioned in history books. But ours--the Chicanos--is still a living thing. [7]

According to a widely accepted account the term "Chicano" is a truncated version of "mexicano." [8] The present writer has been told reliably that "Chicano" originated pejoratively when early twentieth century Texans tried to say "Chihuahua Mexicans" (mexicanos chihuahuenses) and came up with "chi---canos." Some even claim that the "chican" in "Chicano" came from the English word "chicanery," a term often used to describe the famous "Zoot Suiters" of the 1940s, Hispanics who deliberately adopted an outrageous style of dressing and speaking to chide the social customs of Anglos. Still another version was related by a senior statesman among Mexican-Americans in the lower Rio Grande Valley who told the present writer that "Chicano" originated out of a corruption of English and Spanish words involving blatant profanity and that this was an early reason for people of Mexican origin to resent the term. [9]

A recent thoughtful appraisal of the term by Rudolph O. de la Garza is valuable.

> Whatever the origin of Chicano, today this term refers to Mexican-Americans who are no longer willing to be treated as second-class citizens. The Chicano takes pride in his cultural heritage and vigorously denies any suggestion that he is culturally deprived or inferior. Recognizing the equality of all people, the Chicano, through violent or peaceful means, seeks to have the nation at large recognize the role his people have played in shaping this country and to insure that all Mexican-Americans will be treated with the respect and dignity promised to U.S. citizens

> by the Constitution. The Mexican-American might also have great pride in his cultural heritage, but unlike the Chicano, the Mexican-American does not recognize any systematic inequalities specifically affecting him, or at least is unwilling to challenge them if he recognizes them. [10]

Politically, "Chicano" took on a special meaning in the sixties and seventies, one associated with militant pride. Chicanos defied the establishment, especially in California's southern urban areas. They reminded the Anglo establishment, often bitterly, of who they were.

The author of this preliminary report lived in the Los Angeles area during some of those turbulent years and remembers vividly the actions, "takeovers," and protests of the militant Chicanos and their paramilitary arm, the Brown Berets. When the campus where the author then taught was occupied by National Guard troops defending the populace against the turbulence of the Watts Riots in 1965, several Chicano spokesmen commented "the Negroes made the mistake of burning their own homes. We'll know where to put the torch more effectively," with a huelga de los brazos caidos, a sitdown-slowdown strike. [11] Many schools were paralyzed by Chicano-led strikes. The Los Angeles city government took notice. Chicanos had gained respect, deference, and some outrage.

A central concept in the Chicano movement was unification of the Mexican-American people in quest of common goals. Earlier in the century (before World War II) people had formed their ethnic barrios or neighborhoods with built-in divisions. People from the countryside of old Mexico brought with them a profound

distrust of urban folk. Thus urban and rural people were set against each other in the barrios that formed on the edges of cities or within their depressed zones. There was also a division between the poor English-speakers and the poor Spanish-speakers which carried its own measure of distrust. The Blacks involved in this equation were especially frightening to the Hispanics given the greater militancy of their lifestyle. Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and Mexican-Americans had conspicuous cultural differences often keeping them apart. Thus unification of America's legion of Hispanics was difficult.[12]

Mexican-Americans especially have felt they are losers because of their lack of unity. Paul González, who identified himself as a Great Plains Chicano, argued the same thing: that in the Mexican-American community there is always internal conflict, people who cannot agree for personal reasons, and this personalism would impede Mexican-American sociopolitical progress.[13] Such personalism is not good for overall Hispanic progress. Can acrimoniously rival Hispanics agree peacefully on an issue so explosive as the uncontrolled clandestine migration of their own ethnic members into the immediate community?

When Cubans migrate clandestinely into the United States they are almost routinely given legal status as political refugees. When economic refugees come from Mexico they are classed as illegal aliens and sent back. The critical difference comes when the refugees are from the Central American nations of Guatemala and El Salvador. They too claim political refugee status. But it is usually denied them by the United States

government which seeks to maintain friendship with the regimes from which they are fleeing. Deporting these people back to Guatemala and El Salvador often means their death. [14] Giving someone voluntary departure into Mexico, or physically putting them across the line, means little more than a new confrontation with Mexican poverty and a later chance to return clandestinely to the United States. People of Mexican and Central American origin resent the favored treatment given to Cuban refugees, merely because the dictatorship they flee is Marxist. They resent the Vietnamese refugees on much the same basis. Thus the migration and refugee questions are intimately bound up in the dynamics of Hispanic politics within and among the various ethnically defined subcultural groups.

In our study in Kansas we have uncovered testimony, to be developed later, as to the strength of hostile feelings and ideological incompatibilities that divide some of the competing Hispanic groups. One concern is that such divisiveness may impede fulfillment of their earlier cited historic mission, i.e. bridging the Latin and Anglo cultures of the hemisphere.

Hispanics may also be divided socially and politically within a specific ethnic subgroup. We have developed testimony from within the Mexican-American component of local Kansas Hispanics as to bitter personal rivalries. During 1984 a dispute over whether to continue an agency known as KACMAA (Kansas Advisory Commission for Mexican American Affairs) placed the personality-based divisions within the Mexican-American community in bold relief. It appeared to this observer that the

emotive nature of that political struggle might be a continuing impediment to KACMAA realizing the goals for which it was ostensibly created. Rancorous disputes of this kind augur poorly for the likelihood of a "Chicano Quebec" ever coming to fruition on a regional scale (i.e. how can Mexican-Americans organize a regional political entity if their own local houses are severely divided?).

Another divisive phenomenon is the clandestine migration of Mexicans who are economic refugees from their own country. They come to Kansas taking advantage of the footholds their forebears established for them. But they are not always well treated when they arrive. Some well-established Hispanics in Kansas tell us they are ashamed to be associated with the new immigrants, often calling them "wetbacks." Sources of this shame range from the new immigrants' inability to speak English, to their poor social manners and use of profanity, to the fear that the daughters of U.S. citizen Mexican-Americans will take up with the lower-class Mexican migrants. Some of the migrants complain of severe personal abuse at the hands of U.S. citizen Hispanics, even to the point of saying they get better personal treatment from Anglo employers. Many Mexican-Americans want the clandestine migration stopped. But they dislike the Simpson-Mazzoli Bill which will do just that because it seems to engender a further stigma against people of Mexican origin generally. The politics and emotions intertwined in the process constitute a difficult "can of worms" to interpret and untangle.

In the study to follow we will seek orderly meaning out of the myriad of influences, actors, norms, styles, skills, and arenas that are involved in the Hispanic sociopolitical process in Kansas, a microcosm of the Great Plains. Much of this preliminary work is being done in the Wichita area from which we intend to expand later into a much larger and more ambitious enterprise covering the entire state. It is hoped that we will formulate a set of testable propositions about the dynamics of Hispanic life that will be valuable pedagogically and as a basis for public policy formation. And in so doing we intend to maintain existing friendship and mutual respect with the many Hispanics who have given us valuable help in launching this endeavor.

On Proving One's Valor: Quality of Life Vignettes and Glimpses

In the pages to follow the reader will appreciate that socioeconomic reality put a strain on early Hispanic immigrants, especially the Mexicans, like it did no other immigrant group in the twentieth century. The Hispanics in Kansas were continually, often bitterly, called upon to prove their goodness and worth. The following vignettes and glimpses from the three decades following World War I are offered to round out the picture of this challenge. This growing-up experience inevitably became part of the contemporary cultural heritage of today's Chicano activists. Sensitivities emerging from those years condition the personal instincts and group behavior patterns of many within the current Hispanic community in Kansas.

A Mexican immigrant to Kansas found that numerous other

Mexican immigrants were exemplary in their loyalty to the state when things got bad:

> It was the Mexicans who stayed in Kansas through the depression even when hundreds of families moved out. It was the Mexicans who stayed and braved the dust storms, the terribly dry and hot years, of one of the worst periods in Kansas history, when people went hungry and the freight trains were full of people searching for odd jobs or just begging. They stayed and carried on the work.[15]

And later Mexicans were tolerant, albeit sadly, when certain of life's privileges and rights enjoyed by the Anglos were denied them:

> 'Well, so you're going to Garden City. Do you know your brother's address?' 'No. I only know that he works for the Santa Fe.'
> ...
>
> Until my brother came for me, I stayed in the American's house. After twenty-three days my brother arrived and took me to Garden City. There were some six or seven families here when I came. It was not easy for us; we suffered a lot.....We, the old ones, bought or rented houses in this district on this side of the railroad track because they would not sell or rent us houses on the other side. There were men who didn't want us there.
>
> When my son went off to war, I went with him to a bar. I asked for a beer. The owner told me that he would sell it to me but that I would have to drink it outside because they wouldn't allow me to drink it inside.
>
> 'Listen, my son is leaving for Germany to fight for us so that you can have your business.'
>
> 'Get out, get out!' was the proprietor's answer.[16]

But World War II became a source of great pride for Mexican-Americans. Many distinguished themselves as heroes, disproportionately so when compared with the overall American population. Following the war racist barriers began to fall, some gradually. It was painful to justify denying service in a restaurant to a man whose valor had significantly helped to defend America from the ravages of the Third Reich. Native Kansas writer Richard Noriega elaborates on this theme:

> When World War II ended I was 17. I felt cheated, left out, but things began to change. Our people came home and we had reason for pride. We had been reminded by our Anglo brothers that Mexicans fought for Mexicans, Negroes for Negroes, and Anglos for Anglos. I never questioned this. It made sense to me, at least then. From time to time newspapers told of Mexican soldiers who were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. I wondered if it might come with red, white, and green for us Mexican progeny. I always questioned whether my birthright of citizenship depended on whether someone liked me or not.
>
> A Mexican, who later became my brother-in-law, was awarded the Silver Star and two Purple Hearts fighting the Japanese in New Guinea. Japanese infantrymen overwhelmed the American lines. A retreat was ordered. John remained at the frontline guarding four mortally wounded soldiers who could not retreat. The following day the Americans counter-attacked, and they found John wounded along with the others. The four soldiers told of John's nightlong combat, and he became a hero.
>
> Still years later I asked him if the other soldiers had been Mexicans and John replied they were Anglos. Why would a Mexican do that for Anglos? John smiled. He didn't answer. I shouldn't have asked. Nobody has seen his medals. His wife keeps them wrapped in cotton flannel, and in a chest which is off limits to all others. [17]

Children of Mexican immigrants often had to learn English and then teach it to their parents. The children were called upon to translate on-the-job, go to stores with a parent to assist in making purchases, help others in dealing with government officials. In order to achieve such bilingual ability the second generation children frequently had to spend two years in first grade, "after which they progressed normally." [18] The emergence of bilingual skills did not necessarily guarantee that children would think and react bi-culturally. Intrinsic differences between the Anglos and Mexican-Americans reveal some of the dilemma of biculturalism.

> The cultivation of our differences is far more productive than the accumulation of our similarities.....For the Mexican, his heart controls his reason. For the Anglo, his reason controls his heart....Culture is emotional to the Mexican. It is intellectual to the Anglo. The Mexican prefers sentiment to reason, faith to intellect. This, of course, leads to a very imperfect and disoriented life, but we like it. [19]

Housing was a mixed bag for Hispanics in pre-World War II Kansas. In Wichita the Mexican people early tended to occupy the north end of town and with some scattering about the south end. In the north there was little but open country beyond Mexican settlements on the fringe and these residences were relatively secure from commercial encroachment. On Wichita's south side, however, businesses began to crowd the Mexicans out and push their living areas close to the railroad tracks. Some Mexicans leased ground from the railroads and from the American Warehouse Company. Later that company sold some of the land out

from under them in the late 1940s. It was reported that by this time racist discrimination in housing had diminished notably, thereby facilitating some of the demographic transition that had been put upon these Hispanic people. [20] Somewhat worse conditions prevailed in Lyons, Kansas. Salt companies there leased houses without running water or toilet facilities. But still the Mexicans "dug in" and formed protective mutual societies to deal with poor living conditions. Much worse were housing conditions in Dodge City. As Hector Franco remembered it:

> The worst housing conditions we have seen were located at Dodge City and Emporia. At Dodge City about fifty families have lived for thirty years inside the railroad yards in broken down shacks that are a fire menace and a sanitary problem. Living conditions are hard to describe, but filth and squalor are the only adjectives that describe the huddled shacks, and the families cramped in the enclosure that resembles a concentration camp. When we were there in 1935, it was hard to tell whether the children or the dogs running around loose were the dirtier. [21]

The same writer contended that such conditions in Emporia had been substantially improved by 1950 but felt that in the same year the Mexican colony in Dodge City still remained a disgrace. He also pointed to one comparable blighted area in Wichita at the junction of Waterman and St. Francis which local health authorities ordered vacated and burned. He said that Garden City also had its share of urban blight in which Mexicans had been forced to take up residence. Apparently, as of 1950, most of these conditions were in the process of substantial improvement.

Housing for migrant Mexican workers has continued as both a private and social dilemma since Franco wrote his observations about Dodge City, Kansas in 1950. Government attention to the illegal workers accelerated in 1954 but the focus was sending them back to Mexico under "Operation Wetback." Ten years later the Bracero Treaty with Mexico ended, thereby closing the principal legal route for Mexicans to come for work in the United States. But they kept coming clandestinely, often being forced to live in poor housing. By this same time housing conditions for the U.S. citizen Hispanics had improved markedly. The conditions of life for most Mexican-Americans were in stark contrast to those of the illegal aliens. Mexican-Americans appeared like aristocrats beside some of their ethnic compatriots from Mexico. At some point resentment and antagonism sprouted. Mexicans began disparaging Mexican-Americans as "pochos" who had adopted gringo ways. Some Mexican-Americans found it profitable to exploit their illegal alien brethren. Suffice it to say here that cleavage between the legal Mexican-Americans and the illegal Mexican migrants is one aspect of the migratory impact that merits further inquiry and analysis.

Living conditions documented by Franco in the 1930s and 1940s prevailed for some illegal Mexican workers well into the 1980s although, on a lesser scale to be sure. The present author photographed abominable living conditions for Mexican workers in Arizona during the 1970s where men were forced to sleep outside amidst rotting fruit under citrus trees with only plastic sheets as a roof. The men had no toilets and were obliged to pay

exorbitant food prices at a company store. [22] Other bad conditions were found by the author in eastern Missouri and southern Illinois where a self-identified Chicano landlord rented dirty mattresses on a floor for people to sleep on in shifts. Some of these workers were found by INS investigators to be involved in ostensibly illegal work (shredding new cars that had allegedly been used for criminal purposes) and had been threatened with disclosure to the INS if they repeated what they had seen. [23] This impacted negatively on other workers, U.S. citizens, who lost their jobs since the illegal aliens were preferred for the dubious work. Their silence was more easily assured.

A further quality of life issue emerged out of migrant worker housing whenever the cause of victimized illegal workers was taken up by a specialized counselling service. One example occurred in 1974 when the Illinois Migrant Council, a non-profit organization receiving several millions of dollars annually in state and federal funding, defended a group of illegal Mexican aliens and low-income migrant laborers generally who had been evicted from living quarters without due process. The incident stemmed from a dispute over parasites at the Union-Jackson Labor Camp near Cobden, Illinois. The camp's management blamed the health problem on dirty living habits of the Mexicans. It also blamed the Illinois Migrant Council for encouraging the workers to be defiant of camp regulations. Interviews by this author indicated that the workers did have a pattern of improper use of toilet facilities, thereby contributing to flies and parasites. It also seems, however, that their eviction was high-handed

and lacked fairness. A spokesman for the defendant fruit growers said the workers had free legal help from the Illinois Migrant Council and frivolously abused the legal process, adding that the growers would stop raising fruit if they could not maintain discipline in the labor camp. Of the Illinois Migrant Council he said "they are supposed to be teaching them (the Mexicans) manners and morals, but they are not teaching them anything." [24] Other examples of community conflict over treatment of Mexicans involve the Colorado Migrant Council, and the MANZO Area Council of Tucson, Arizona. There are numerous instances from California and Texas which could also be cited. [25]

The principal issue raised above is personal abuse of migrant Mexican workers, regardless of whether it is committed by Anglos or by Hispanics. There seems, however, to be emerging evidence of a notable tendency on the part of some Hispanics to abuse their compatriots who are of lesser means and status. Esteban Serge, a young man recently migrated from Michoacán, told this writer of his own grandmother, living here in Wichita, who takes bitter delight in disparaging his every effort to learn English. The grandmother speaks some English and makes it so terribly uncomfortable for Esteban every time he says an English word that he can no longer do it in her presence. The put-down from this experience discouraged him from taking ESL (English as a Second Language) classes offered at a Wichita church. He has since found a way to earn private English tutoring in exchange for teaching Spanish to the tutor. He related "I don't know why grandmother feels she has

to treat all of us immigrants that way, but she runs down nearly everyone. She acts more Anglo than the Gringoes themselves."

Another Wichita respondent gave the author a foreshadowing of the depth reached by this instinct-rooted behavioral pattern. She related that when she came here earlier in the century from Mexico at age 10 she was put into an elementary school where Mexican children were already in attendance. The respondent, Nidia Tehandón, knew no English and so was socially and academically behind the other Mexican children with whom she tried to make friends. But Nidia recalls being severely and cruelly abused verbally by her Mexican compatriots. She was ridiculed for not being able to speak English. But the American children were usually kind, she remembered, and invited her to play. From there sprang her knowledge of English. Nidia learned English well enough to be able to take revenge on the Mexican kids in either language, but she didn't! She resented what they had done, but tried to forget it and to develop friendships with both Anglos and Mexicans. Her mother said that would be the best way.

The case of Nidia recalls other sensitive aspects of the acculturation process which the Mexican immigrants underwent. She was refused service in a beauty shop in Wichita on her 17th birthday, just for being Mexican, and remembers having to sit in segregated areas of movie theaters. Just because Mexicans and Negroes were often forced to sit together didn't make them automatically friends; that was another cultural gulf to be addressed. When told of testimony accumulating in the 1980s about Hispanic

owners of restaurants in Wichita who abuse their illegal Mexican employees, Nidia commented "those people are not good Christians... they have little love for their fellow man, especially if he is down and out...that's when they step on him because anyone who is down probably deserves as much...that's what those people think."

Later in this study the comments of a Mexican psychologist on the phenomenon of abuse and discrimination among the Hispanics will be presented and discussed. Overall, however, the formation story of Hispanics on the Great Plains is one of dedicated settlers and sojourners who were honest, reliable, and who cared for their own people with kindness. The experience of the mutual societies or mutualistas is cited in this regard in the following chapter.

Many Hispanics, especially those of Mexican origin, have provided us with impressive testimony as to the human traumata and hard-won satisfactions of the Mexican immigrant epoch of the twentieth century. Sotero H. Soria of Wellington, Kansas remembers painfully the lifestyle in Mexico during 1918 before he migrated to the United States. When he was 7 years old he and other children were forced to harvest wheat by hand and put it into ox-carts. The foreman beat them with a whip, he said, "to keep them warm." Sotero would like to forget those times.[26] But the greatest triumph of his life was when he and his wife were finally united in Wellington, Kansas. They were an ambitious couple and worked unceasingly to learn English and to get ahead; they are now so respected by children and grandchildren

that none of them have ever drank liquor in the Sorias' presence. They appear to be Hispanic immigrants whom one might wish as a prototype for all others..."we can say that America is the dream of everyone. Everyone has his eyes turned toward America." [27]

The above quality of life observations suggest a number of directions which this inquiry may eventually take. We are interested in the human condition of Hispanics in Kansas both as perceived by us, the researchers, and as the Hispanics themselves see it. By drawing together into a paradigm the influences and actors who make up the total socioeconomic arena we may lay a public policy basis for eventual intervention in it. If not, we can at least benefit from an appreciation of the struggle these Hispanics undergo in the quest for the good life via minority status in America.

One side benefit of this project is the discovery of unpublished studies, scrapbooks, "fugitive works," and other oral testimony that can be employed to create historical contexts with which to reflect on the present quality of life for Hispanics on the Great Plains. One highly valuable unpublished paper was done by Professor Robert Oppenheimer of the Department of History at the University of Kansas, Lawrence, ("Acculturation or Assimilation: Mexican Immigrants in Kansas, 1900 to World War II, no date but of recent authorship). An example of valuable work by a student-scholar is the study of "Little Mexico" in Garden City, Kansas by Richard J. Lopez, "El Sueno. . . The Dream," done at Wichita State University in 1984. With continued discovery of such materials we hope to provide a rich cultural anchoring for this inquiry into Hispanic migrant impact.

On the Condition of Minorities-Hispanics on the Great Plains

Social position, and how one perceives it, is likely to be a criterion frequently used by social scientists in distinguishing groups as minorities. Attitudes and beliefs, "world views" and symbolic-emotive responses, are surely more significant in distinguishing a minority group than are mere numbers. Social disabilities, perceived and real, and consciousness of those disabilities are related criteria for minority identification. Minority people need to be aware of their similar traits and shared social disadvantages. As Henri Tajfel sets forth in his The Social Psychology of Minorities "some sociologists make a sharp distinction between what they call a 'social group' and a 'social category.'" [28] Categories of people are likely to be socially neutral, e.g. fat people or those with red hair. People in a group, on the other hand, must have clear principles, institutionalized rules, characteristic informal behavior, a system of internal regulations, and a potential for long-lasting cohesiveness, e.g. the Palestinians. [29] The true minority group will have an internal awareness that it is different from the dominant society (or surrounding constellation of societies) and that others view it as different. Often the development of such an awareness is a sociopolitical goal of minority activists.

Being identified as a minority group member would, therefore, carry with it certain social consequences (as in the case of a person whose physical features did not distinguish him or her from the dominant society and whose ethnic status was subsequently divulged). Thus, Tajfel argues,

> It is only when being assigned and/or assigning oneself to a particular social entity leads at the same time to certain perceived social consequences which include discriminatory treatment from others and their negative attitudes based on some common criteria (however vague) of membership that the awareness of being in a minority can develop. [30]

This is to say we cannot imagine damaging social consequences, like social discrimination, emerging from one's disclosure that he or she is allergic to penecillin, but such unpleasant consequences could very well emerge from divulging that one is a "white Negro."

Moreover, the way we type someone as a member of a specific group usually gives us a basis for inferring other characteristics about that person. If the inference goes to the point of social or political characteristics then we believe (rightly or wrongly) that we have some predictive ability to reflect upon a person's actual or potential behavior. For example, we would probably not be able to predict a person's position on a political issue from color of hair or allergic sensitivity, but we might be able to predict that a member of the Hispanic group LULAC would oppose the Simpson-Mazzoli Bill for immigration reform. With somewhat less predictive strength we might predict that a Mexican-American would oppose the same bill. However, if a question were posed (as we do pose it in this study) as to whether the continued clandestine migration of Mexican nationals into the United States is desirable we may have virtually no predictive power at all vis a vis the Hispanic minorities. On the other hand, we might very well find high predictiblity that American Blacks will oppose clandestine Hispanic migration.

In the present study of Hispanic minorities on the Great Plains it is necessary to examine something of the history of real and perceived social and cultural differences between the minorities under study and other groups in the society. This means considering the pervasiveness of Hispanic separateness. We must question whether Hispanics will always remain identifiably separate from the remainder of society even though they may achieve mobility as individuals (i.e. does becoming a doctor, minister, or engineer make one any less a Hispanic after than before?). Another consideration is whether skin color and other physical traits will permanently and indelibly relegate one to Hispanic membership. If status appears unmoving and fixed then still another consideration is whether the Hispanics may, indeed, like it this way, and may even seem to derive benefits therefrom. And if there are marked differences among Hispanics on these issues are there other traits and attributes which seem to offer explanatory correlations? This will imply some evaluation of the strength of Hispanic consciousness, to the degree that one actually exists, and the parallel Hispanic perception that clearly defined group boundaries exist which impede exit and miscegenation.

If there is a conflict between the urge to leave the minority group and external barriers erected to prevent such leaving, then such conflict may "create, in time, a new consciousness of belonging, give a new strength to old affiliations, and it may finally lead to powerful internal constraints against leaving the group." [31] Another way of putting this would be

that if Mexican-Americans see themselves as prevented from leaving the minority group (either as a result of internal constraints or external barriers) then why not convert to Chicanos and work toward an Aztlán or "Chicano Quebec" movement! But if both the status quo and Aztlán are unacceptable then the minority group member is confronted with an emotional dilemma having at least potentially both personal and public implications for the field of mental health. Identifying such potentials will be a collateral goal of the present research as it probes the Hispanic vision of the good life and the congruency between that vision and others in the surrounding society.

Specific testable propositions should emerge from this study. They will bear directly on the quality of life for Hispanics on the Great Plains. Can the distinction cited earlier from de la Garza's work between Mexican-Americans and Chicanos be operationalized so as to identify and predict behavior of specific persons, organizations, or entities? How do the "world views" of such groups compare with those of Cubans and Puerto Ricans? At a less global level this study will examine key areas of conflict and consensus between Hispanics and public agencies, like the police, schools, and the INS. Consideration will be given to the role of private groups, especially churches, in satisfying many Hispanic needs to which government agencies seem unable to respond effectively. Emphasis will go to Hispanic perceptions of various facets of the illegal alien problem in America. Here some comparison will be made between attitudes we are now sampling on the Great Plains and those gathered earlier by

de la Garza in a series of opinion surveys across the United States. We will estimate, on the basis of extensive interviewing, the degree to which the illegal alien issue is alienating Hispanics (Chicanos in particular) from their potentially natural allies, i.e. the Blacks, labor unions, and other ethnic groups.[32] Similarly an evaluation is expected of internal Hispanic dissension over the illegal alien issue. Here we should note in passing that whereas Cesar Chávez once strongly opposed the presence of illegal alien migrants he later reversed himself and began trying to organize illegal workers regardless of their alienage.

Ultimately, an impact statement must be forthcoming. Accelerated immigration of economic and political refugees from Mexico and Central America respectively has already affected the American political process. It has spawned the often acrimonious debate these past three years over the Simpson-Mazzoli Bill which still awaits final passage by a joint congressional conference committee. Immigration reform is an issue that has cut across party and class lines as perhaps no other issue could, the nuclear freeze being one possible exception. Immigration could impact on the cohesiveness of sub-groups within the overall Hispanic minority sector. It has already had an impact on the American political system. The reaction of our political system to the immigration drama may, in turn, affect the destinies of other countries.

Ethnic population input, and ways of identifying with it, spawns new social and political behavior. Ready evidence of

this are the U.S. churches that are offering sanctuary to the refugees from Central America and those that are running outreach clinics for the migrant workers from Mexico. Both of these phenomena have local counterparts here in Kansas. Ethnic groups, markedly different from each other, do have an impact. We will examine it here in Kansas with a constant view to ways of making that impact reconcilable with existing social and political structures.

It has been observed that "whatever else Spain gave to the New World, a sound political tradition was not high on the list. Immigration from Latin America brings with it that tradition and culture." [33] But the Hispanic peoples among us do, as we noted earlier, bridge that cultural abyss. They filter much of the cultural disparity that continued migration brings through an acculturation process often called "Americanization." Therefrom arises the likelihood that we will continue to fashion ways, here on the Great Plains and elsewhere, of celebrating our differences creatively. The crucial issue is more likely to be whether we can do so in a way that does not sacrifice the values of one group for those of another and, at once, whether the dominant social system can foster a peaceful multiethnic process from within.

Perhaps, in the long run, an assessment will emerge of both the social and political potential for a "Chicano Quebec" coming to fruition as a substructure of the broader American system. That will be conditioned by the extent to which the Hispanic vision of a good life coincides with visions throughout the rest of the

population. Also to be considered is the impact of dramatic changes in American immigration law. There are those in the self-styled Chicano community who are frequently quoted by the Mexican press as critical of the 1984 Simpson-Mazzoli immigration reform bill for it's ostensible racism but who, at the same time, see the more restrictive U.S. immigration policy as galvanizing Chicanos and undocumented workers into a new coalition. [34] In this scenario the perceived threat of ethnic repression could serve to "Chicanoize" part of the Hispanic population, an alternative to "Americanization" which the policy-makers surely did not intend.

Some of the questions thus raised by our Hispanic migrant impact study have rather global implications, as seen in the foregoing comments. The relatively manageable size of the Hispanic population here in Kansas facilitates use of this area as a Great Plains "laboratory" for migration studies. After the research has been criticized, revised, and reissued we hope to have within our grasp a fuller appreciation of the cultural richness which the Hispanics bring and set a basis for public policies that will better honor their needs and reconcile them with broader social goals. In the process we expect to learn something about the degree to which "Americanization" of ethnic differences may have produced an irretrievable cultural loss for all concerned or, conversely, to what extent cultural richness has in fact been enhanced.

Footnotes (Johnson, Chapter One)

1. Political elites and governing regimes in Third World countries have sought to divide and manipulate the poor by organizing them on the basis of ethnicity, as opposed to pan-Indianism which could threaten elite power structures (e.g. Guatemala, Peru in the 20th century). Populists of the left often advocate policies that would eliminate ethnic distinctions in their drive to incorporate the dispossessed into the power mechanisms of the state. Either way, the cause of multiethnicity is likely to suffer. Assuming that multiethnicity is to be considered a virtue by most North Americans the negative Third World lessons of Ethiopia, Nigeria, Burundi, et. al. compared with the positive experience of Tanzania, for example, and the Brazilian experience overall, should be instructive. See Norman B. Schwartz, "Ethnicity, Politics, and Cultural Survival," in Cultural Survival Quarterly, Vol. 7, Spring 1983, No. 1, p. 20.

2. It can be argued that "celebrating our differences" is a national Canadian pastime as evidenced in the officially sponsored publication The Canadian Family Tree, Don Mills, Ontario, Corpus Information Services Ltd., 1979 edition, passim.

3. From a story written in The Los Angeles Times by Marita Hernández and Robert Montemayor, July 24, 1983.

4. Ibid.

5. Not to be confused, of course, with localized power-holding circumstances in Texas and elsewhere in the American Southwest.

6. Stan Steiner, The Mexican Americans, London, Minority Rights Group, 1979, p. 11.

7. Paul González, "The Midwest Mexican Experience," Entrelíneas, Vol. 5, No. 1, 1976, p. 2.

8. Matt S. Meier and Feliciano Rivera, The Chicanos: A History of Mexican Americans, New York, Hill and Wang, 1972, p. xiv.

9. Permission to quote is now being sought.

10. Rudolph O. de la Garza, "The Politics of Mexican Americans," in Arnulfo D. Trejo, ed., The Chicanos: As We See Ourselves, Tucson, University of Arizona Press, 1979, p. 101.

11. A valuable collection of articles on ethnic relations is found in Southern California's Latino Community, a series of articles reprinted from the Los Angeles Times, copyright of bound collection is 1983 (available directly from the newspaper).

12. Steiner, op. cit., p. 11.

13. González, op. cit., p. 4.

14. Chicago Religious Task Force on Central America, Sanctuary: A Justice Ministry, 1983, and other publications (407 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill. 60605).

15. Hector Franco, The Mexican People in the State of Kansas, Wichita, The University of Wichita Department of Religious Education, Master of Arts Thesis, 1950, p. 43.

16. Margaret Beeson, Marjorie Adams, Rosalie King, Memories for Tomorrow: Memorias Para Mañana, Detroit, Blaine Ethridge Books, 1983, p. 68.

17. From Richard Noriega's unpublished typescript Mexican Illegals: Epidemic Futility, Wichita, July, 1984, passim.

18. Franco, op. cit., p. 46. A very limited treatment of Mexican-Americans in Kansas is found in John C. Russell and Walter D. Broadnax, Minorities in Kansas: A Quest for Equal Opportunity, Topeka, Office of the Governor (Economic Opportunities Office), 1968.

19. Sabine Ulibarri, "Differences and Similarities Between the Spanish-American and the Anglo-American Cultures," Entrelíneas, Vol. 5, No. 1, 1976, pp. 6 and 8.

20. Franco, op. cit., pp. 49-50.

21. Ibid., emphasis added.

22. From the quthor's Mexican Democracy: A Critical View, New York, Praeger, 1978, p. 214.

23. Ibid., p. 220.

24. Southern Illinoisan, October, 1979 issue, front page.

25. Relevant here is Philip L. Kelly's article "Illegal Aliens in Southern Colorado's San Luis Valley," in Kenneth F. Johnson and Nina M. Ogle, Illegal Aliens in the United States, Washington D.C., University Press of America, 1978, pp. 93-128.

26. As quoted from Beeson et. al. op cit, p. 54.

27. Ibid., p. 69.

28. Henri Tajfel, The Social Psychology of Minorities, London, Minority Rights Group, 1978, p. 4.

29. Ibid.

30. Ibid.

31. Ibid., p. 6.

32. Rodolfo O. de la Garza, Chicano Political Elite Perceptions of the Undocumented Worker: An Empirical Analysis, San Diego, University of California (Program in United States-Mexican Studies), Working Paper # 31, p. 8.

33. James Fallows, "Immigration: How It's Affecting Us," The Atlantic Monthly, November, 1983, p. 90.

34. Reies López Tijerina, César Chávez, Lupe Díaz, and Esteban Posada are quoted to this effect in Proceso, Nro. 391, April 30, 1984, pp. 13-14.

CHAPTER TWO

MIGRATION AND CULTURAL FOOTHOLDS IN KANSAS

Whereas ocean passage was an uprooting cultural barrier to cross for European immigrants, this was generally not true for the Hispanics who came to North America. Latin Americans, especially the Mexicans, could usually go home with geographic ease if they so chose. What forced them to leave and put down footholds in the United States was the repressive lifestyle of their homelands. This featured exploitive land tenure, rigid class barriers, debt peonage, widespread poverty, and political violence. For the poor masses Latin America held out little tenderness. But then twentieth century North America beckoned.

The 1920s spawned an accelerated employment of seasonal labor in the American Southwest. At the same time, new immigration laws severely restricted the coming of immigrants from southeastern European countries and from the Orient, two of the traditional recruiting areas for America's manual labor needs. Urban industry was attracting both Blacks and Anglos into the cities, leaving agricultural labor to the Latin Americans who were usually only too willing to accept. For geographic reasons Mexico became the major worker-sending nation.

Mexico in the 1920s then emerged from a revolutionary war whose legacy was thousands of economic and political refugees. Many joined the arduous trek north seeking peace and work. Hiring them, the economic solution for U.S. enterprises, was at once an escape from poverty for the Mexicans. In the 1920s

cheap Mexican labor helped capitalize much of America's agriculture and industry, notably in the Southwest. The demand for Mexican workers became especially urgent during the two world wars, this despite the fact that many were asked to leave when things later got tough in the depression of the 1930s.

As word of economic opportunity spread, legal Mexican immigration was rapidly surpassed by illegal or clandestine migration. New terms were thereby added to our mixing-pot culture, braceros or legal workers, the "wetback" or espalda mojada and the coyote or pollero who smuggled the "wets", the enganchador who profited by arranging "trips" north and then often fled after pocketing the peasant's money, and the enganchista who contracted workers for U.S. employers. [1]

By the 1970s the clandestine migration of Mexicans and other Latin Americans into the United States was more desperate. War in Central America, tyrannies elsewhere, created refugees. The northern Mexican border grew choked with loose, desperate, displaced people waiting for their chance to cross over surreptitiously. Border cities like Ciudad Juárez had "floating" populations allegedly into the hundreds of thousands just waiting to migrate clandestinely.[2] Often such entry into the United States wrenched peoples' lives. Families were separated, loved ones were lost. Not all the migrants agreed that it was worth such traumata, but somehow they had to survive. [3] That instinct, survival and a new life, eventually brought many Mexicans and other Hispanics onto the Great Plains and into Kansas. This chapter is about their cultural legacy.

Tracing the Hispanic Thrust into Kansas and the Great Plains

We do not know when Hispanics first started coming into the Great Plains either as sojourners or as homesteaders. Early references distinguish the Spanish explorations of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and show Kansas well within the cultural reach of New Spain. Probably most noteworthy of the Spanish incursions was that of Francisco Vásquez de Coronado beginning in 1540 which sent back to the King of Spain descriptions of the rich soil and curious natives the explorers encountered. The Coronado expedition found large unfenced ranches of horses and cattle whose herds grew into the "thousands wandering over...the Great Plains." [4]

It is believed that the Spanish explorers and colonists of those years started what would become a three-century experience of trading with Kansas' native Indians thereby securing footholds which endure in the state to this day. As a Mexican-American scholar in Kansas City would later write, "we have never severed the umbilical cord, because Mexico is at our back door, to the south. In three hours out of Kansas City we can be back in Mexico, sharing the culture, the history, the language and becoming involved in a full fellowship that no other minority or ethnic group can do so easily." [5] Let us note in passing that the fellowship referred to in the quote is often more readily celebrated verbally than in actual deed, [6] yet geography has endowed Mexican Hispanics with a valuable solidarity base that is widely used.

Hispanics are a longstanding and significant ethnic component of Kansas society but statistics on their coming and growth are elusive. Noting the difficulty inherent in assigning numbers a Wichita writer of the 1950s observed that a great many came, stayed, and constituted a new racial stock to be reckoned with. Further, he wrote, "if historians take into account the contributions of the German people, the Swedes, the Mennonites, the Italians in southeastern Kansas, and the Yugoslavs of Kansas City, the Mexicans must from now on, be remembered as the newest and latest addition..." making up the people of Kansas. [7] Their coming was often painful both physically and psychologically. A local spokesperson of the 1970s contended "we came as intruders, a source of cheap labor, and we performed tasks that no one else would accept. The railroad tracks became the Camino Real...we lived in box cars, dilapidated hovels, and these became our total environment, our habitat. As if being socially ostracized were not enough, we were frequently cheated out of our wages..humiliated and impoverished. We built the great railroads...from Texas to Kansas City...Omaha to Newton, Kansas, we toiled and suffered. We displaced other minorities. We now were the excluded minority." [8]

The Hispanics, in the majority Mexicans from the 19th century on, entered the Great Plains in search of the proverbial living space and in this quest they competed with other ethnic minorities. But the Mexicans had a special claim on being in Kansas and most of the territory south and west. For it was the special historical fact that this land once formed part of Mexico. A war of conquest by the United States ended with the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848 whereby Mexico received some 15 million dollars in payment

and recognized its loss to the victors of a major territory consisting of Texas north into Kansas, west through Colorado and Utah to include California and everything to the south. When, in 1853 the United States needed more room to extend railroads into the southern reaches of California the Mexican dictator Santa Anna sold an additional chunk of land in what is now the southern part of Arizona for that purpose. So Mexican Hispanics of the late 19th and early 20th centuries migrated for the most part into land that had once belonged to their nation, not to mention those who had their nationality "changed" by having lived in the territory that had been lost in the war.

Relatively few of the original Mexican immigrants came to the new territory as proven artisans or professionals who also wanted to Americanize themselves. The bulk of the migration seems to have corresponded, at least in the twentieth century, with economic and political distress in Mexico and concomitant demands in the United States for flexible supplies of cheap labor. The periods surrounding our two world wars corresponded with heavy, and welcome, Mexican immigration into the United States. In the Great Depression years of the 1930s thousands of Mexicans were seen as a threat and asked, often forced, to leave; in those times the distinction between repatriation and deportation was often blurred. Many tragedies were created when families were broken up, uprooted, and even native born American citizens were deported to Mexico just because they had been born into families of Mexican origin. This fact does not escape the memories of Hispanics living on the Great Plains today. Of this

epic period one of them wrote "as times became hard during the 1930s the repatriation and deportation activity became accelerated. It is documented that over 500,000 of our people were deported and approximately one-half of these were native born Americans." [9]

When the Mexican Hispanics came north one of their most frequent first stops was Texas, a stopping point for many and a jumping off point for many others. Texas was a piece of the geographic transfer from Mexico, the state whose declared independence from Mexico and its brief period of sovereignty from 1836 to 1845 served as one pretext for the Mexican-American War (1846-1848). Quality of life circumstances for Hispanics in Texas left much to be desired well into the twentieth century and those conditions motivated many Mexicans and Mexican-Americans to migrate north into Kansas. Although problems of ethnic acceptance were encountered there also it was common for twentieth century Hispanic migrants to Kansas to remark "well, at least it's not so bad here as in Texas." Conditions of ethnic coexistence in Texas elucidate many of the problems Hispanics have met elsewhere, and deserve comment here.

It is perhaps fair to say that many native Texans have been raised with the view that their state possesses a unique culture, even a nationality, all its own, thereby making Texas something of a subculture within the United States. In this context, then, many Texans can't forget that their state was once an independent country, the only such case in the continental United States. Many of these same Texans consider all non-whites to be foreigners.

To the degree that Mexicans and Mexican-Americans are seen as non-white they may also have this foreigner stigma visited upon them. The stigma is likely to be ascriptive with color, hence some Spanish-Americans (of Spanish descent, i.e. Spaniards from Spain as opposed to Mexico) who are often lighter skinned may suffer less of a stigma than do their brothers and sisters from Mexico. Nor has the discrimination against Mexicans always stopped just because someone "got his papers" and became a naturalized American citizen; it is that bitter ethnic fact which makes the Texas case so extreme and so difficult for Hispanic Kansans to forget.

An example of this was captured some years ago by the author Robert Coles who was writing about the Hispanic population in Texas' lower Rio Grande Valley. A member of the Texas Rangers, then a seemingly Anglo-dominated state police organization, told Coles that Mexicans born in Texas didn't really belong there and shouldn't pretend they felt at home. [10] The "wetbacks" Coles studied were often indistinguishable from the legal residents and citizens who worked in the migrant labor "stream." All were under the threat of being laid off should they displease the boss who all too often was wont to say something like "behave yourselves, work hard, and don't complain 'cause if ya do thousands of your kind are just-a-waitin' south of the border just-a-dyin' to take your place if we kick ya out." Those same Mexicans stated they had all too often been arrested by the local police and sheriff just for the way they looked and hauled off and dumped in the next county. One such victimized Mexican,

a native born U.S. citizen, had repeatedly been told to take his alleged political activism and get out of Texas.

> "I've been told to go to New Mexico, where there are a lot of people like me, and where the Anglos and the Mexicans share power--that's what one sheriff said to me. He said my trouble was that I didn't know the difference between Texas and places like California or New Mexico. He said that in Texas the Mexicans aren't going to be allowed to 'take over'. What else can you do when a guy has two guns on his belt and a rifle beside him, and a button nearby that will bring ten or twenty more guys, all armed like him? This is a free country...Texas is a great state...but who can believe it...?" [11]

The above is contemporary and real. Not a few Kansas Hispanics migrated here after first trying life in Texas and finding the ethnic "problem" more than they wanted to bear. But this is not to suggest that the barriers of prejudice progressively collapsed the farther one migrated north. Class exclusion and racism have been prevalent in America and although the worst vestiges may have been put down in the civil rights revolution of the 1960s there are many today who feel that the United States is still a racist society. To appreciate the accomplishments of those Kansas Hispanics who have risen above such cultural barriers and captured social and professional prestige it is instructive to view some of the specific impediments to their upward mobility which had to be confronted and examine these confrontations within the 20th century historical context of the Great Plains.

Western Kansas in the 1920s: Anglo Mental Syndromes and Early Hispanic Life

We spoke with several old-timers, Hispanics who had lived in western Kansas around Garden City and Goodland during the early years of this century and who migrated thereafter to Wichita; they confirmed that the attraction of sugar-beet employment was a major pull factor attracting the early Hispanic immigrants. We do not now enjoy access to precise memoirs from life in western Kansas in the 1920s. We do have the benefit of one study done by Paul S. Taylor, an early pioneer of research into Mexican immigration from a socioeconomic standpoint. Persons who had been native residents of western Kansas in those years confirmed the similarity of much of Taylor's account of the northeastern Colorado beet field region to western Kansas as far as the socioeconomic conditions of life for migrant Hispanics were concerned. Our assumption, then, is that the northeastern Colorado picture summarized below is by and large characteristic of western Kansas in the late 1920s historical context.

Touching Kansas on the far west, northeastern Colorado embraced an area especially well adapted to the cultivation of sugar beets that was known in the 1920s as the South Platte Valley. The area comprised the now well-known communities of Fort Collins, Loveland, Greeley, and others. It was long a center for sugar beet cultivation which attracted thousands of migrant laborers north from Mexico during the first half of the twentieth century. Earlier the area had been populated by German-Russian immigrants who were often viewed by Anglos as

better citizen stock than the Mexicans and better worker stock than most migrant American whites. At this time (the 1920s) the United States still had a notable contingent of migrant agricultural workers who were of Anglo-European descent. When it came to competing for worker excellence the Mexicans soon distinguished themselves. Increasingly the sugar beet growers and sugar companies favored their coming despite the social resentment of many other U.S. citizens who wanted to keep American society "white and pure."

One sugar beet grower told the researcher Paul Taylor that the Mexicans, even though he didn't like them ethnically at first, turned out to be better and fairer help than the German-Russians, that Mexicans treated their women and children with more kindness. [12] Other growers were not so pleased. The claim that "one Mexican will cause more grief than a large number of Japanese" [13] also had its advocates. There was a prevailing Anglo-held notion that success made Mexicans arrogant and lazy, that they worked better and more reliably when they were poor. Yet from Taylor's work a trend seemed to emerge for the sugar beet growers to become more and more satisfied with their Mexican laborers in comparison with other racial stocks. But always lurking in the background were currents of racial prejudice: one grower said that Mexicans, like Negroes, were born for servitude and that when a Mexican wouldn't take off his hat to a white man that was the time to fire him; another compared Mexicans favorably to watch dogs that got used to being kicked around but still could be molded into a more loyal protector than any white man. [14]

In the northeastern Colorado study Taylor found abundant evidence in the 1920s of worker exploitation by opportunistic employers. In 1927 the International Workers of the World (I.W.W.) led a beet workers strike in Colorado with negligible results. One of the main complaints aired during that effort was the miserable life of workers who lived in "beet shacks" often so poorly ventilated and hot in the summer months that the workers were unable to sleep. The I.W.W. favored creation of worker colonies with public services and leasing of land to Mexicans who would become growers themselves rather than merely contracting out their labor. The I.W.W. also generated a great deal of class struggle rhetoric which seems not to have impressed the Mexican workers.

It was noted by Taylor that not all the Mexicans felt antagonistic toward their employers. Some even lauded the treatment, housing, and pay they received. The impression should not be given that all Colorado growers of the period exploited their Mexican help inhumanely, quite the contrary. Sugar companies were also found to be giving certificates of merit to the best laborers as a way of singling them out for preferred treatment at future times of employment decisions. Contract laborers, Taylor found, worked with greater self-discipline and initiative in northeastern Colorado than did the gang laborers he had studied in the Imperial Valley of California. [15]

The Mexican laborers in northeastern Colorado were subject to long periods of seasonal unemployment due to the growing cycle of sugar beets. In some years, like 1925, drought caused the beets to fail, leaving protracted unemployment among the

Mexicans. Taylor judged that the Mexicans possessed less foresight and initiative than their laboring predecessors, the German-Russians and Japanese, and therefore required proportionally more social welfare expenditure. He noted that the German-Russians in particular had been paid higher wages than were the Mexicans. [16] The latter also tended to need relief expenditures proportionally greater than their numbers. The same was true of law enforcement demands, at times owing to the misbehavior of the Mexicans and on some occasions because local authorities sought to fill arrest quotas by picking up Mexican vagrants as an "easy catch." The political weakness of Mexicans as a group in those years made them especially vulnerable to arrest although this was hard to quantify. Both Mexicans and Spanish-Americans felt the Anglo community generally sought them out for blame in cases of disorderly conduct with most of the blame usually heaped on the seasonal workers from Mexico who tended to be itinerant. Mexicans living in worker colonies frequently undertook group efforts to maintain order and establish a good reputation among the Anglos. [17]

It was customary for the sugar companies and the beet growers to advance credit to the Mexicans against future wages so as to tide them over during periods of inactivity. This usually took the form of food provisions contracted for at local stores. Only occasionally was an advance made in cash. There was seldom any problem in recuperating the money loaned even though Taylor noted that the Mexican workers as a class were "notoriously improvident." [18] It was usually left up to

the workers themselves not to overspend their wages. Cases were reported of merchants who would overcharge the workers and of car salesmen in particular who went out of their way to persuade Mexicans to buy vehicles they could not afford. Some growers took a paternalistic attitude, counselling their Mexican workers against such contracts. Taylor believed that the practice of advances was not a form of peonage that would have tied the Mexicans perpetually to a given creditor in order to work off a seemingly endless stream of debts. The fact that many Mexicans in Colorado during the 1920s did, nevertheless, get trapped by debts which kept them from moving seemed more a function of their own poverty and lack of foresight rather than a deliberate conspiracy of usurers against them. [19] The need to repay advances was also cited as a factor in keeping Mexican children out of school. When the workers did fall on dire straits there were small ethnic societies which offered spiritual comfort and limited material assistance.

Unlike the Japanese and German-Russians who preceded them, few Mexicans were able to purchase land or homes in western Kansas and northeastern Colorado in the 1920s. The few who did acquire property most often did so in the context of a workers colony that was typically sponsored by a sugar company intent on holding its local labor force. Some Mexicans also leased land under profit-sharing arrangements with the landlord. There were few success stories to report and the turn-over among Mexican lesees was found to be high. They generally had to content themselves with growing beets on the poorer lands. Mexicans were

described by Taylor as nonentrepreneurial persons who, for the most part, preferred the security of a contract to the risks of carrying one's own harvest to full term. The Mexicans seemed to have a cultural impediment when compared by Taylor with other ethnic groups:

> The cultural gap to be bridged is greatest in the case of the Mexicans. They do not bring with them from their culture and class the background for undertaking agriculture independently according to American methods, the ambition for individual acquisition of property, and the foresight necessary for its accomplishment. [20]

German-Russians and Japanese had been in Colorado much longer than the Mexicans and they came when land was easier to acquire.

Thus, in those years, it was widely assumed that the socioeconomic mobility of the Mexicans would be severely restricted and that their political clout would progress no faster. There was not yet enough of an established Mexican population (as did then exist in the Imperial Valley of California) to constitute the kind of market force that would oblige businesses to incorporate Mexicans as employees. In larger cities such as Denver, however, the socioeconomic force of Mexicans in the 1920s was being felt. Yet most Mexicans in those years were near the bottom of the socioeconomic scale. They commanded little in the way of deference or status.

Mobility for these early Mexicans was discouraged by the practice of keeping children out of school to help fulfill labor contracts in the beet fields. An entire generation of youth

emerged sharing an underdog stigma. Non-enforcement of school attendance by local authorities merely worsened the anti-educational bias of the contract labor system for sugar beets. Many German-Russians also kept their children out of school during part of the beet season, but these parents already had a mobility potential such as their Mexican counterparts did not then enjoy.

Since beet growers were frequently members of school boards they had little incentive to insist on enforcement of school attendance laws. Ultimately, if the beet growers chose to sacrifice education in preference for child labor, they got away with it. We know such practices also prevailed in the Garden City area of western Kansas as documented by Hector Franco who also confirmed the similarity of other conditions in Kansas to those in Colorado. [21]

In some sectors a racist feeling existed that Mexican children would benefit little from schooling. Since many of them were migratory why concern oneself with their schooling? Such mental baggage prevailed throughout the Anglo community and was one of the more nefarious barriers Mexicans had to overcome in their drive for progressive minority status in America. All too many established Americans would just as soon have kept Mexicans as expendables and pariahs. Adding to this syndrome of backwardness was the prevailing apathy of the Mexicans themselves during the 1920s. Taylor wrote "they do not generally appreciate schooling and feel that the need for earning comes first." [22]

In addition to restricted socioeconomic mobility the Mexicans tended to cluster their residences into groups that came to form isolated neighborhoods or barrios. This applied to those workers not living in beet shacks located on growers properties. The practice of company-sponsored colonies contributed to this isolationist tendency. Certain parts of given towns came to have names, sometimes uncomplimentary ones, denoting them as Mexican neighborhoods. Mexicans often shared neighborhoods with Negroes and poor whites. This physical isolation tended to encourage social ostracism in the community at large. There were many informal, and some formally written, covenants that restricted Mexican penetration into Anglo neighborhoods. Often heard was the Anglo fear that "flocks of old cars will be standing in front of the places rented to Mexicans."

Many Mexicans of the 1920s felt their only hope for socioeconomic mobility was to get away from ethnic colonies so as to expand their contacts with Anglos and have the chance to prove themselves in new relationships. The colony had resembled a socioeconomic prison with little chance of parole. Some growers feared decentralization of the living space of the Mexicans for the likelihood that union proselytizing would occur via the I.W.W. or other unions. Thus, early isolation of Mexicans into colonies did not seem to be the result of any single factor, but grew instead out of a combination of various circumstances in the multi-cultural mix of the times.

There was a notable tendency to accord higher social status to Spanish-Americans, those with a more clearly identifiable genetic linkage to Spain, even though their ancestral lineage

may have passed through Mexico. Spanish-Americans were descendants of the Spanish settlers of southern Colorado and New Mexico who, for the most part, had not miscegenated with Indians or mestizos. Taylor observed that the Spanish were often credited over the Mexicans with better manners, dress, language, and stature. Many Mexicans seeking to claim for themselves greater "whiteness" referred to themselves as Spanish. But Spanish-Americans and Mexicans were culturally linked and the difference between them was a matter of perceived degree. The Spanish-Americans in the 1920s were largely citizens, however, not immigrants subject to legal uncertainties about their alienage. Spanish-Americans of northeastern Colorado also took considerable pride in their World War I achievements, something the Mexican-Americans would also herald with well-deserved pride after the Second World War. There was a propensity by the Spanish-Americans to disparage the Mexican immigrants and to try to keep a social distance from them. Some areas had worker colonies wherein only Spanish-Americans could settle; this was not by law or formal covenant but by informal practice. When later generation Mexicans born in the United States claimed Spanish as an identifier the distinction between them was blurred. Spanish-Americans had often been small landowners in the Southwest whereas Mexican-Americans tended to be, or to have been, salaried laborers.

All of the foregoing resulted in considerable social isolation for the Mexicans and Mexican-Americans, a self-perpetuating socio-economic barrier condition that they would need to cross en route to acquiring the advanced status many of them now hold in the 1980's.

The early Hispanics faced segregation in the schools when they were allowed to attend following periods of intensive work in the beet fields. This perpetuated language differences. There were also differences between Mexicans and Anglos in matters of personal hygiene. These often were played up by hysterical Anglo parents. Spanish-Americans resisted the segregation more than Mexican-Americans, insisting that they were Americans like anyone else. Mexicans from Old Mexico were more likely to accept segregation and discrimination. Spanish-Americans were more likely to protest not being invited to participate in the P.T.A. than were Mexican-Americans. Whereas American farm hands commonly ate at the grower's table, the Hispanics in general did not. This Anglo preference for ethnic distancing was very obvious. The attitudes of Anglos against the Hispanics in northeastern Colorado and western Kansas were reportedly more rigid than was the case in southern Colorado and New Mexico.

Racist activity by the Ku Klux Klan was a frequent occurrence, most commonly involving the posting of handbills listing places (restaurants, parks, theatres, etc.) where Mexicans were unwelcome. Businesses where bulk purchases predominated over personal relations (groceries as opposed to beauty shops) were more willing to accept Mexican trade and, of course, to profit from it. Staple goods boycotts by Mexicans needing food often forced merchants to remove discriminatory signs from their windows. Mexicans, for their part, learned to control hostile bitter feelings, yet these would surface as time progressed. Inescapably the Mexican who eventually served bravely and honorably

in the U.S. Army only to be refused restaurant service at home had an unpleasant emotional pill to swallow. A few Christian churches made efforts to overcome the racism. Such efforts were complicated by Catholic fears of losing Mexicans to Protestantism or to Marxist-oriented union organizers. The failure of religion to surmount the entrenched racial bias surfaced in ethnically divided churches and in church-sponsored "Americanization" classes intended for Mexicans.

Some beet growers preferred to keep the houses of Mexicans living on their property widely separated from their own domicile. Yet others told Taylor that both the Mexicans and Spanish-Americans were highly desirable as close residents. One Anglo even went so far as to say that the Mexicans were desirable and benevolent while the "whites are vicious." [23] But greater alarm was voiced in the 1920s over the potential intermarriage of whites and Mexicans than in the matter of closeness of dwellings. Strains of tolerance appeared in the schools when some Mexican children were judged by educators as more desirable subjects than were German-Russian offspring. The racism of the Anglos in northeastern Colorado and western Kansas was not an impregnable monolith...it had cracks through which small drops of human kindness penetrated. The farmers needed the Hispanics economically. They were less eager to have them socially. Moral conscience sometimes bridged those economic and social realities. It was Anglo men who most acutely felt the need for the Mexicans economically. Their wives harbored the greatest social fears. Seeds of cultural strife, as well as of productive competition had been sown. The

Hispanic foothold in western Kansas had been established as the migration continued.

But the fortunes of much American agriculture leading into the years of World War II held out tenuous hope of a promising economic base for Hispanics, especially those caught up in migrant "streams." The writer Carey McWilliams noted in some Kansas areas a marked tendency for the size of farms to increase between 1910 and 1930 and along with this the number of farms naturally decreased. This put many laborers off the farm as mechanization grew along with the size of units being cultivated. McWilliams noted the increase in "suitcase" farmers, the concomitant decline in dirt farmers. In fact, the decade of the 1930s registered a decrease in the overall population of Kansas by 82,184. [24]

Farmers and their workers were moving to town to look for the sort of employment that would be difficult for Mexican migrants to perform. Mexicans, in turn, then began to fill in temporary work spots in agriculture created by this exodus from the countryside. As Arthur F. Corwin has noted, "Mexican labor mobility was ...vital to the foundation and maintenance of the beet sugar industry in Colorado, Kansas, California, Nebraska and other states...in mining as in agriculture, Mexican workers took jobs which other groups refused...." (from his Immigrants --- and Immigrants: Perspectives on Mexican Labor to the United States, Westport, Connecticut, Greenwood Press, 1978, p. 47).

Hispanic Migration into Eastern Kansas: Urban Clustering and the Railroad Influence.

Nineteenth century American agriculture and industry made use of large numbers of Oriental and southeastern European workers as we have previously seen. The presence of Chinese and Japanese was especially apparent in railroad construction and in much heavy agriculture. But the combined effect of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 and the Gentlemen's Agreement with Japan in 1907 was to shut down most of this Oriental labor supply. Railroads switched predominantly to Mexican labor in the early 1900s and this is a prominent underlying historical factor in the Hispanic migration into central and eastern Kansas. Construction work on railroads occurred sporadically throughout the Southwest and the Great Plains. Both the Santa Fe and Southern Pacific railroads depended heavily on Mexican laborers by the end of the nineteenth century. "No immigrant group in American history has been so intimately tied to the railroads as the Mexican. Railways provided the major arteries of migration from Mexico and railroad companies were the principal employers of Mexican nationals in the United States." [25]

By the early 1900s Mexican construction gangs were at work in Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas. Some of those who had migrated into Texas originally for agricultural pursuits also came north doing railroad work. A number of those who had been in Colorado and western Kansas working the sugar beet fields sought better opportunities in the eastern half of the state. There were also lesser numbers of Mexicans who came to Kansas as political exiles

fleeing the Mexican Revolution of 1910-1917 and its tumultuous aftermath. Poor economic conditions in Mexico were a constant factor in the migratory pattern leading out of that country and into eastern Kansas.

The Kansas City area, including parts of Kansas and Missouri, had been a focal point for Santa Fe Trail commerce in the second half of the 1800s. There was a thriving steamboat trade unloading at the Kansas City landing for connection with western land travel. This included the Gold Rush of the 1840s and much of the western expansion movement. Mexican caravans also came as far north as Kansas City to unload the goods of international commerce. In 1884 the Mexican government established a rail link with the Santa Fe at El Paso, Texas thus connecting Mexico ultimately with Kansas City and greatly facilitating Mexican migration into eastern Kansas. Kansas City served as a gateway to the Great Plains from its strategic location at the union of the Kaw and Missouri rivers. As the approximate geographic center of the United States, it was a natural hub for the railroads, many of which located their repair shops and warehouses in the area. Meatpacking, flower milling, rendering, oil processing, and farm equipment companies were established around Kansas City by the late 1800s; real estate developments followed. In this period a small Kansas City suburb known as Argentine was established (in the 1890s) and Mexican laborers, attracted largely by the railroads and the packing industry,began to crowd into housing formerly occupied by Greeks and other southeast Europeans. The early Mexican immigrants occupied some of the worst housing in an area already heavily

polluted by local industries operating without modern environmental and ecological constraints.

The early Mexicans in the Kansas City area fought a socioeconomic war of attrition with the Greeks, Italians, and Yugoslavs who were already there. The Mexicans needed to gain acceptance both as workers and as human beings. This inevitably meant pleasing the Anglo custodians of power whose mental baggage featured cultural acceptance barriers similar to those faced by the Mexicans in the sugar beet fields of western Kansas. During World War I Mexicans made notable employment headway in the packing and railroad industries.

A valuable study by Judith F. Laird contends that it was the labor demand of World War I more than anything else which gave Mexicans their most enduring socioeconomic foothold in the Kansas City area in the period between 1914 and 1920. [26] Much of this Mexican work force was transient and seasonal, many came and went according to the vicissitudes of revolutionary war in their homeland. "Mexican communities in Kansas have been characterized throughout their existence by a continual coming and going of Mexicans." [27] Upper class Mexican elements during the revolutionary period (1910-17) tended to be more transient internationally and less likely to put down firm roots. The Mexicans who more often became permanent residents were of the laboring classes. Those not working in the packing industry most likely came via initial employment in either the Santa Fe or Rock Island railroads. Laird believes the Santa Fe to have been the more successful of the two in attracting Hispanic migrants. That, she

contends, is really how the barrios of Kansas City, Kansas got their start. Other nearby communities in Kansas received Hispanic population input in this way. Excess migrant workers brought in by either the Santa Fe or Rock Island railroads were readily available for employment in other industries of east central Kansas.

From the Mexican point of view in the early twentieth century it was attractive to migrate into the Great Plains via the railroads because when labor was seasonal workers normally received free passage back to the Mexican border, thereby avoiding the problem of stranding that often would affect their compatriots who migrated decades later. In 1905 the Santa Fe used Mexican laborers in its Kansas City yards near the neighborhood known as Argentine on the Kansas side. Many lived also in boxcar camps. Laird reports an estimate of 600 Mexicans living in Argentine, Kansas as of 1907 but the federal Census of 1910 apparently found only eighty still in residence. By 1914 the population had grown to over 600 while other predominately Mexican barrios were being established. [28] The largest of these on the Missouri side was called Westside. Before 1940 Westside was a center for social contact among Mexicans from both Missouri and Kansas who took advantage of an efficient Metropolitan Street Railway System for urban transit. [29] That important piece of infrastructure, now missing from nearly all Great Plains communities, united the Mexicans of Argentine, Kansas with Hispanics throughout the growing Kansas City urban area. They had, of course, specific places to congregate, like the Hotel Paraiso owned by Kansas

City's political boss, Tom Pendergast, that was eventually closed down in 1916 after police raids uncovered vice therein. Community affairs, and news of Mexico, were shared via El Cosmopolita that was published by the Mexican refugee community in Kansas City between 1914 and 1919. [30] Mexicans were strictly segregated in most social activities during those years.

The Kansas City area entered the 1920s with at least six predominately Mexican barrios occupying parts of both Kansas and Missouri. The heavy predominance of single male laborers inevitably meant attempts at transitory friendship with Anglo women which, in turn, caused the same sorts of fears that were evoked during the early miscegenation process in western Kansas and northeastern Colorado. Few of the early migrant workers put down roots unless they brought wives with them. Some of the political refugees from the Mexican Revolution did bring wives and a few others stayed on after marrying United States citizens. But the biggest input of permanent residents, either through marriage or permanent migration, came during World War I when the industries of Kansas City responded to demands of the First World War.

> Some Mexican laborers profited from the disruption of European migration caused by the outbreak of war in Europe in 1914, but the major breakthrough in employment opportunities for Mexicans in Kansas occurred in 1917. The war-related industrial expansion, rather than the immigrants' aspirations, created the avenues of upward occupational mobility for Mexican immigrants. [31]

Argentine, Kansas, then, can be considered a kind of microcosm for studying the beginning quality-of-life experience of Mexicans

in eastern Kansas.

The first recorded Mexican immigrants to Kansas' state capital, Topeka, came in 1903. It is believed that within two years they had settled in the Kansas City area including the community of Argentine.[32] Many of these lived as dependents of the Santa Fe Railroad which had brought them and few of these seem to have put down permanent roots, returning to Mexico or south into Texas as the work demand fluctuated. After 1910 the Mexicans who came into the area tended to remain longer. Their biggest surge into eastern Kansas seems to have been after 1914 and corresponded with labor needs felt nationally as a result of World War I. The following table gives a rough comparison of selected Kansas populations including Argentine over a near-sixty-year spread.

It is reported that by 1920 the total Kansas population of Mexican-born persons was 13,568 and that this figure declined to 11,166 in 1930. But at the same time in the latter year the state total of persons of Mexican origin had increased to 19,150.[33] The Laird study cautions against uncritical acceptance of such early population figures. It seems likely that the Kansas census figures in those years represented an undercount, especially in terms of the longevity of many of the Mexican migrant respondents. The fact that many Mexican workers in the Newton, Topeka, and Kansas City areas lived in boxcar dwellings (which could be, and were, moved from place to place depending upon work demand) suggests that the population figures for Mexicans were probably too low. Compared with the census data for Argentine in Table B, the estimate

TABLE B

PERSONS OF MEXICAN ORIGIN IN SELECTED KANSAS COMMUNITIES:
A ROUGH COMPARISON OF 1925 and 1980

	1925	1980
Kansas City, Kansas	1194	
Dodge City	155	
Newton	277	
Wichita	593	
Argentine	130	

Sources: Laird thesis cited variously herein, Kansas Census for 1925, U.S. Census for 1980

by Laird circa 1925 was "about 900 including men, women, and children." [34]

The Mexican railway network tended to facilitate the growth of migratory patterns from given Mexican localities to specific receiving communities, even to specific enterprises of employment, within the United States. In previous studies I have noted tendencies for Mexican immigrants to come from specific home locations to other specific destination locations in the United States. [35] This includes a contemporary pattern whereby natives of the villages of Cherrán, Zamora, and El Llano in the Mexican state of Michoacán would migrate into specific areas of southern Illinois and eastern Missouri. My testimony has it that these migratory patterns, both legal and clandestine, were established as early as World War I. They persist today. Laird, in her study of Argentine, Kansas, found that "immigrants from one Mexican town, Tangancícuaro, Michoacán, settled almost exclusively in Argentine, and worked, almost without exception, as shop laborers." [36] Mexican migrants, thus, have informally created a system of what could be termed "sister localities" in the United States.

Such migration was undoubtedly stimulated by the occasional practice of the Mexican government (during World War I) of providing free transportation from interior states like Michoacán (with high peasant unemployment) to the northern border where American labor recruiters would give them assignments. Once footholds were established by individual families they perpetuated the migratory pattern destined to serve given employers. The

abundance of Mexican labor in the border areas made it necessary for the migrants to go farther north in search of regular, albeit seasonal and intermittent, employment. And although eastern Kansas had a harsh winter when compared with Mexico it was much less severe than Minneapolis, for instance. And easy rail connections with the Mexican border at El Paso and Laredo made the Kansas City area an ideal destination for Mexican migration. Much of the Mexican migration into eastern Kansas came from the central Mexican plateau states of Guanajuato, Michoacán, Zacatecas, Jalisco, and Aguascalientes, with the first two states providing over 57 percent of the work force for the Santa Fe Railroad in the Kansas City area between 1905 and 1940.[37] These were two of the most heavily populated Mexican central plateau states on a basis of inhabitants per square kilometer.

Many of the early Hispanic settlers in eastern Kansas (around 1925) are known to have left family and friends at home to care for agricultural plots. Often the migrant workers took leaves of absence from railroad work in the Kansas City area to return to Mexico during the critical harvest and planting seasons there. Laird found that this pattern typified the migrants from the village of Tangancícuaro in Michoacán.[38] Droughts and crop failures in Mexico, thus, would affect the numbers of migrants coming to and remaining in eastern Kansas. Intermittent political violence in Mexico had similar effects.

Most of the employable males in the Argentine, Kansas colony of 1925 worked for the Santa Fe Railroad which, along with supporting service industries like the boxcar factory, dominated

the socioeconomic life of the barrio. Private companies supplied Mexican labor to the railroad for no fee but in exchange were allowed to run the railroad's commissaries on which the Mexican workers depended heavily. [39] Serious abuse and extortion of the Mexicans often occurred. Franco reported that the railroad commissary often overcharged its captive customers. [40] On the other hand the railroad gave subsidies for workers to bring their families during heavy work periods and usually returned them to the border free. Employee loyalty was cultivated through the practice of hiring family and friends, a custom which undoubtedly reinforced the tendency for certain villages to send migrants to given enterprises and localities. Entire Kansas barrios were formed by recruiting workers from a particular Mexican town, e.g., the Topeka barrio was formed out of Mexico from the village of Silao, Guanajuato in 1907. [41] In the 1920s some depopulation of Mexican villages was reported as large migrations went north to the United States. Not all such migrants founded sedentary barrios however. Many joined "floating gangs" that lived in the movable boxcar villages which the railroad maintained. Rapid turnover, especially of single males, became a company problem and some efforts at providing amenities were made to stabilize the work force. Preference was given in 1911 and thereafter to hiring Mexicans who would bring their wives. Materials were often provided to workers who would construct makeshift homes made of railroad ties on company property. These were grim surroundings and often the Mexicans did better on their own seeking housing out in the community. Nevertheless, boxcar and railroad

tie housing was reported still in existence as late as 1929 in Emporia and 1950 in Dodge City, Kansas. The character of the housing situation in eastern Kansas was probably no different qualitatively than found in the western beet field area. In the east, however, the Mexicans seemed to have more options. During the 1920s Mexicans began to purchase modest housing in the Argentine barrio.

Competition for workers forced the Santa Fe to promote bilingualism among its foremen and to raise worker pay occasionally to meet competition from other railroads. The pay was more easily improved than the language. Children of workers often served as interpreters and straw bosses were sometimes appointed. This, apparently, was cheaper than paying wages to attract English-speaking employees in the 1920s. It was also common for Mexicans to leave railroad work for higher temporary wages during the Kansas wheat harvesting season in June and July. Competing railroads used the pages of La Prensa of San Antonio, Texas to proselytize workers away from Santa Fe; it was reported that the local Spanish language paper of Kansas City, Kansas, El Cosmopolita was strongly anti-Santa Fe and quite openly urged workers to take employment elsewhere. Santa Fe had acquired a reputation, not always justifiably, of paying low wages and mistreating workers. Santa Fe's supply agent, the Hanlin Supply Company of Newton, Kansas was similarly accused. [42] Other railroads operating in Kansas took advantage of this bad publicity to recruit Mexican laborers away from Santa Fe promising cleaner boxcars, free garden plots, complaint departments, and other

attractions. Kinship ties and the extended family or compadrazgo helped maintain social cohesion in the barrios of eastern Kansas. Sick or needy persons would move in with godparents or relatives and there was, as in western Kansas, limited recourse to charitable associations which sprang up. The unemployed were also helped by these informal supportive networks.

The Santa Fe Railroad itself served the cause of social integration; its Spanish name conveyed a paternalistic image to some Mexicans despite controversies over wages and humane treatment. Should new immigrants from Mexico appear they could usually stay with friends or family until work became available with the railroad. This seems to be an advantage which the eastern Kansas urban barrios enjoyed over the sugar beet colonies of western Kansas. The vital life-support systems reported within a compadrazgo context in Argentine seem to stand out in comparison with what we now know about the western Kansas experience. These extended family networks were of value to the Mexicans during times of labor turmoil, such as during 1922 and 1923 when Anglo workers in the railroad shops went on strike. Only limited attempts were made to use Mexicans as strikebreakers but when this occurred it left bitter race relations in its aftermath. Hector Franco related the memory of one Hispanic in Wellington, Kansas who could not forget that Mexicans had been hired when the Anglos went out on strike and said the townspeople still held that fact against the Mexicans who in effect became strikebreakers. [43]

The majority of Mexicans worked on section gangs and in

unskilled categories with lower pay and prestige than was enjoyed by the shop workers. Track laborers were associated with the low prestige boxcar camps which, in the 1920s, were predominantly Mexican. Many Anglo shop workers had, of course, begun their railroad careers as track laborers before the hiring of Mexicans became fashionable. Although there seems to be little evidence that the Santa Fe discriminated between Mexicans and Anglos in pay for the same job it is true that Mexicans as a group tended to get the dirtiest and lowest paying jobs available. [44]

There were complaints about the early Mexicans as laborers to be sure. Most early immigrants refused to learn English, they often abruptly quit a job for a better offer or to return to Mexico, they were poorly suited to cold winters on the Great Plains, and their frustrations often led to alcoholism and violence. But the eventual balance sheet on the Mexican railroad workers was favorable.

> ...their refusal to be clannish, excellence as gang laborers, ability to do a full day's work in a hot climate, and faithfulness made them perhaps the best of all foreign workers. A Santa Fe official agreed that the Mexican laborers as a whole were about as steady as could be obtained for the price. He also noted that when they first arrived in this country many Mexicans were weak and malnourished. After they had been here for a month or so, however, they regained their strength and made commendable workers. [45]

Along with this notable testimony one must consider that Mexican workers in Oklahoma and Kansas, in the decade of the 1920s, were receiving between 2.50 and 3.00 dollars for an 8 hour day.

Mistreatment of Mexican workers employed by the railroads in eastern Kansas seems to have most often taken the form of personal abuse by foremen, extortion by service companies and commissary agents, and tricks to deprive workers of legal recourse for on-the-job injuries. There was considerable evidence of ethnic discrimination and racism in the interpersonal relations of Mexicans and Anglos, including insistence that Mexicans adopt more pronounceable "Americanized" names. At least within the railroad community it was the foremen, the immediate on-the-job bosses, and not the company, who Mexicans most often blamed for the abuses they suffered. The railroads did serve the cause of giving the Mexican migrants economic roots in eastern Kansas just as the sugar beet enterprises had done in the west. To an important extent the railroads distributed the Hispanic population in eastern and central Kansas and laid a basis for the future socioeconomic mobility which the progeny of those early migrants, i.e. today's Hispanics, would enjoy.

To some degree the Mexicans in the urban colony of Argentine recreated their native village homelife patterns including celebration of a need for paternalism. The Mexicans required powerful authority figures and institutions. Thus Laird observed significantly "their allegiances and commitments were to the Catholic Church, the Santa Fe Railway, and their families." [46] Those three sources of authority were important in the eventual transition Argentine made from a work camp to a community. Yet it was common for family ties also to be maintained with Mexico. This was seen in the use of Mexican-owned banking houses that issued

money orders redeemable in Mexico and which also facilitated the sending of goods to maintain families back home. It appears that the practice of remitting money back to Mexico was well established in the 1930s and along with it grew that nation's international dependence on the earnings of her transplanted emigres.

In the pre-World War II years (except for the depression repatriation episodes) the mix of legal and illegal migrants was relatively open and little challenged when compared with the sensitivity over alienage that prevails today in the 1980s. With little fear of deportation in those earlier years communities like Argentine functioned as Spanish-speaking islands within the greater English-speaking community. Many workers could spend an entire work career living there without speaking English. This cultural separation may have been furthered by the conduct of Spanish-speaking religion in the area. In 1923 the Catholic Church proclaimed a Mexican national parish in Kansas City at Our Lady of Guadalupe Mission where services traditionally were held in Spanish. This strengthened the barrio as a community for Mexicans no longer had to travel to Kansas City, Missouri for Spanish services. Ethnic discrimination still kept them from joining Anglo congregations. Some Protestant groups, especially the Methodists, made headway in winning Mexicans over to their churches through social service and recreational programs. Fear of Methodist competition led the Catholic Church to name, in 1937, the Argentine colony itself as the site for a second Mexican national parish to serve the Kansas side of that urban complex.

Housing discrimination prevailed in eastern Kansas just as had been the case in the west. However, one gets the impression, at least from Laird's study, that the Mexicans in the Kansas City railroad area acquired home ownership more readily than did others arou the western beet fields. When they bought houses the pattern was for several generations to occupy and transmit the property to each other via the extended family as a socioeconomic mechanism. Mexican housing was clustered in Kansas City, a matter of custom prevailing until after World War II. The clustering grew intense when the Mexicans erected backyard dwellings on a given lot to house friends and relatives who could not be provided for elsewhere. Mexican ownership of housing was definitely on a minority scale. Laird found that in 1925 only fifteen of a total 106 housing units occupied by Mexicans were also owned by Mexicans, i.e. fourteen percent of the total. In 1936 that figure had tripled, reaching fifty-three percent of the total Mexican-owned housing.[47] These figures were for Argentine, Kansas only and did not include housing on Santa Fe property and in several nearly temporary and precarious locations. Ultimately, in 1951, a Missouri River flood demolished the barrio, thereby ruining much of the architectural advances made by the Mexicans. By 1969 only two Mexican families lived in an area that formerly contained over forty families.[48] Floods, economic fortunes, outward migration, and Anglo acceptance of integration, eventually eroded the ethnic character of the Argentine barrio. The Mexicans did not seem clannish once the Anglos were willing to mix with them.

By the 1920s the Mexicans in eastern Kansas had started to

form compadrazgo structures, the large extended nuclear families which had been scarce ten years earlier. This same pattern was observed by Taylor in his study in Imperial Valley, California, more so than in northeastern Colorado. It appears that eastern Kansas afforded greater economic security on which to build such social relationships than did western Kansas. But as a general proposition this should be viewed cautiously and merits further study. The presence of dependent adults in families was taken by Laird as evidence of a strong extended family system prevalent in Argentine, Kansas as of 1925. The notable absence of such dependent adults could have meant that those no longer able to work for income were sent back to Mexico for their retirement. Consecutive generational occupancy of housing was also taken by Laird as evidence of a strong extended family system prevailing in Argentine up until the late 1960s. [49] Observations by Smith about the nearby Oklahoma context in the pre World War II period confirm the existence of strong extended family systems. Obedience to and respect for family elders permeated the community. In the home the father's word was law, women and children were completely subservient, and responsibility for the elders became a lifelong commitment for each successive family generation. [50]

Of course, to the extent that Argentine constituted an ethnic enclave or "urban village" where traditional Mexican values were preserved it may not have been typical of other urban communities in eastern Kansas in which greater cultural miscegenation may have taken place. Wichita, for instance, seems from the vantage point of the 1980s to have undergone a great deal of such miscegenation and extended family systems were weakened in the process.

A good number of the immigrants were, of course, instinctively desirous of returning to Mexico. They may not have done so in many cases because it became financially impossible for their families to subsist without a U.S.-derived income. Such persons could have been "stranded" in a cultural sense, really wanting to return to their native land but being prevented from so doing. [51] Such immigrants may have resisted miscegenation, thereby contributing to the maintenance of large extended families. It is also noteworthy that few Mexicans in the Argentine community sought U.S. citizenship until World War II, a pattern thought typical of eastern Kansas. The war meant that citizenship would be requisite for defense industry employment and also for the acquisition of federally financed relief services. Reportedly no Mexicans in the eastern Kansas area received citizenship before 1923. Of those who did between that date and 1947, eighty-nine percent of the naturalizations occurred during the war years of the 1940s. [52] Evidence from neighboring Oklahoma also supported the contention that Mexicans prior to 1940 were reluctant to become naturalized citizens. In this example the Mexicans were apparently aware of being disliked by the native U.S. citizens and hesitant to mix with them. They were also under strong peer and family pressures to remain within the Mexican culture and avoid becoming "agringado." [53]

Segregation and racial discrimination were, of course, cultural impediments to the miscegenation and/or naturalization of Mexicans in the 1920-1940 period. Most of the same discriminatory practices reported for western Kansas and Colorado were

visited upon eastern Kansas Mexicans as well. Segregated, but definitely unequal, schooling was among the most nefarious of the discriminatory practices which continued until 1951 when the great flood destroyed the all-Mexican school facilities. Segregation in schooling seems to have been more pervasive in eastern Kansas than across the state line in Missouri. Few Mexicans were able to get even as far as high school before 1940 and this, along with the depression of the 1930s, constituted a major barrier to socioeconomic mobility.[54]

Bad economic times in the 1920s and 1930s often found the Mexicans of eastern Kansas needing relief. In 1921 the Mexican government contributed money to a Kansas City area Chamber of Commerce effort to create a repatriation train that would take many of the jobless back to Mexico. The Methodist Mexican Mission in Argentine processed those to be repatriated from that area. Later the same mission managed federal relief funds for the needy during the depression of the 1930s. It also transported indigent patients to medical clinics. The fact that certain diseases like t.b. and syphillis were higher among the Mexican population than among the non-Hispanics made these Methodist social services especially critical to the overall community.[55] Thus began a pattern of rivalry between Methodists and Catholics for social service leadership in the Hispanic community which can still be found in the 1980s in some eastern Kansas communities. In the pre-1940 period Mexicans apparently had little difficulty receiving public welfare services either via church or governmental agencies, regardless of their alienage.

During the depression years when much Anglo resentment was visited upon Mexican immigrants for allegedly taking American jobs, the Santa Fe Railroad took steps to keep its own Mexican employees from being discharged and sent back to Mexico. This was especially important to Mexicans in Kansas where "hire American" had developed numerous fanatical supporters in the state government. Santa Fe is credited with keeping the nationally frequent repatriation drives out of the Argentine barrio [56] and probably out of Kansas as well. This fact endears that railroad to many Hispanics despite other controversies surrounding its handling of human relations. It is said that the depression experience also changed the attitudes of many Anglos toward the Mexicans as instances became well-known of generosity by the latter toward non-Hispanics then in need. As in the western Kansas experience several mutual aid societies were formed to help Mexicans with health and economic problems. By the time of World War II the Mexicans of eastern Kansas could be looked upon as a distinctive ethnic group with more generalized national loyalties. The national war crisis drew on those loyalties constructively, speeding the integration of Mexicans and most other Hispanics into the broader American community. At the same time, of course, second generation Mexicans grew up in a society which eroded the traditional family authority and stressed individual initiative and even adventure as rivals to the traditional authority of compadrazgo.

Footnotes Chapter Two

1. A contemporary folklore survey of the illegal alien subculture can be assembled from: Edmund Villaseñor, Macho, New York, Bantam Books, 1973; Sasha G. Lewis, Slave Trade Today, Boston, Beacon Press, 1979; Grace Halsell, The Illegals, New York, Stein and Day, 1978; Dick J. Reavis, Without Documents, New York, Condor, 1978.

2. El Fronterizo (Chihuahua), January 9, 1984.

3. Memories of those whose survival meant leaving Mexico and coming to Kansas are found in Margaret Beeson, Marjorie Adams, Rosalie King, Memories for Tomorrow: Memorias Para Mañana, Detroit, Blaine Ethridge Books, 1983, passim.

4. Donald E. Worcester and Wendell G. Schaeffer, The Growth and Culture of Latin America, New York, Oxford University Press, 1956, p. 69 and p. 95.

5. Paul González, "The Midwest Mexican Experience," Entrelíneas, Vol. 5, No. 1, 1976, p. 5.

6. Commentary from local Hispanic observer forthcoming.

7. Hector Franco, The Mexican People in the State of Kansas, Wichita, University of Wichita Master's Thesis, 1950, p. 38.

8. Paul González, op. cit., p. 3.

9. Ibid.

10. Robert Coles, "Our Hands Belong to the Valley," Atlantic Monthly, March, 1975, p. 72.

11. Ibid.

12. Paul S. Taylor, Mexican Labor in the United States: Volume I, New York, Arno Press and The New York Times, reprint edition 1970, p. 149 (originally published by the University of California Press, 1930).

13. Ibid.

14. Ibid., p. 155

15. Ibid., p. 162.

16. Ibid., p. 171.

17. Ibid., p. 175.

18. Ibid., p. 176.

19. Ibid., p. 182.

20. Ibid., p. 191

21. Hector Franco op. cit., passim.

Chapter Two contd.

22. Taylor, op. cit., p. 203.

23. Ibid., p. 228.

24. Carey McWilliams, Ill Fares the Land: Migrants and Migratory Labor in the United States, New York, Barnes & Noble, 1942, pp. 103-104.

25. Michael M. Smith, The Mexicans in Oklahoma, Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1980, p. 35.

26. Judith F. Laird, Argentine, Kansas: The Evolution of a Mexican-American Community, 1905-1940, Lawrence, University of Kansas-Department of History, Doctoral Dissertation, 1975, p. 39.

27. Ibid., p. 40. See also Pierre, Braceros, op.cit., passim.

28. Laird, op. cit., pp. 44-46.

29. Ibid., pp. 49-50.

30. Ibid., pp. 52-53.

31. Ibid., p. 55.

32. Ibid., p. 61.

33. Ibid., p. 66.

34. Ibid., p. 74.

35. Kenneth F. Johnson and Nina M. Ogle, Illegal Mexican Aliens in the United States, Washington D.C., University Press of America, 1978, passim.

36. Laird, op. cit., One is tempted to suspect that in certain U.S. localities if one knows the name of a given Mexican alien's employer one can then guess from what village in Michoacán that person comes. If such predictability were found to be on an 80 percent plus basis for certain establishments and sending communities it would suggest some fertile ground for systematic comparative case studies. Other studies have underscored the tendency for Mexican migrants to pick destinations in California, Illinois, and Texas. Wayne Cornelius, Mexican Migration to the United States: Causes, Consequences, and U.S. Responses, Cambridge, MIT Center for International Studies, 1978, pp. 21-22.

37. Laird, op. cit., pp. 84-85.

38. Laird, op. cit., p. 38. Supporting evidence on the linkage of sending and receiving areas in Mexico and the United States is included in Barton M. Clark, "Mexican Migration to the United States," in Thomas Weaver and Theodore E. Downing, eds., Mexican Migration, Tucson, University of Arizona Bureau of Ethnic Research, 1976, pp. 51-63.

39. Laird, op. cit., p. 115.

40. Franco, op. cit., p. 38.

Chapter Two contd.

41. Laird, op. cit., p. 118.

42. Ibid., p. 126.

43. Franco, op. cit., p. 39. Yet today we hear pleas for Mexican workers from those who consider them the most docile of human beings. Consider this testimony: "You get me some Mescans, you hear? Real Mescans! I don't want no chicanos, or blacks or white trash. I want Mescans." From James Flanigan, "North of the Border," Forbes, April 15, 1977, p. 37.

44. Laird, op. cit., pp. 145-146.

45. Smith, The Mexicans in Oklahoma, op. cit., p. 38.

46. Laird., op. cit., p. 160.

47. Ibid., p. 183.

48. Ibid.

49. Ibid., pp. 186-187.

50. Smith, op. cit., p. 60.

51. From Kenneth F. Johnson and Miles W. Williams, Illegal Aliens in the Western Hemisphere, New York, Praeger, 1978, pp. 93-102, a view of the "stranding" of illegal Mexican aliens (IMAs) in a contemporary context.

52. Laird., op. cit., pp. 189-190.

53. Smith, op. cit., pp. 44 and 54.

54. Laird., op. cit., pp. 195-197.

55. Ibid., pp. 200-201.

56. Ibid., p. 204.

CHAPTER THREE

TODAY'S HISPANIC COMMUNITY IN WICHITA: Public Relationships, Policy Questions, and the Illegal Alien Issue

Hispanics and Law Enforcement Agencies

Introduction. On numerous occasions in U.S. history local police have taken it upon themselves to enforce the national immigration laws, thereby creating a pretext for apprehending someone who was suspected of illegal alienage. Today's wisdom of hindsight now suggests that local community welfare is best promoted by leaving such immigration enforcement to the INS, the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service. The recent history of relations between Wichita's Hispanic community and that city's police strongly suggests that this is also true in contemporary Kansas.

In recent years the sensitivity of Wichita's Hispanic community toward the illegal alien issue has been especially intense. Legal U.S. citizen Hispanics often felt they were victims of police mistakes, and at times deliberate police racism, leading to their being harassed on the basis of their looks, i.e. the old and unhappy syndrome in which "you look like a Mexican, therefore you must be an illegal wetback." It is bad enough for people to be stopped merely on the basis of looks and questioned when there is no cause to suspect a crime has occurred. But for them also to be assaulted and/or verbally harassed is intolerable.

An unhappy episode now known as the Monroe Incident illustrates quite vividly the dangers inherent in confounding federal immigration enforcement and local police work in a predominately Hispanic

urban district. Journalistic accounts held that José Hernández, a Mexican national, was last seen on Christmas Eve of 1977 when he left his small apartment at 2022 N. Market in Wichita to go for a walk. While purchasing some beer at the Monroe Liquor Store a police officer walked in and asked Hernández for identification. Hernández spoke no English and allegedly the officer said to him, "You dirty Mexican, you don't belong here" whereupon the officer is said to have grabbed Hernández and a scuffle occurred in which the officer claimed to have used deadly force in self-defense.[1] A great deal of clubbing then occurred and Hernández is said to have gotten the worst of it. "During this time, the clerk on duty at the liquor store called the emergency dispatcher saying 'send somebody because one of your officers is killing a customer.'"[2] The officer in question drove away with Hernández in custody and that, apparently, is the last time anyone in the Hispanic barrio of north Wichita saw or heard of him.

A press investigation showed that Hernández had been treated at St. Francis Hospital later that evening and then released to the police. He was subsequently charged with assault on an officer but this was dropped when INS jurisdiction was established because of Hernández' illegal alienage. It was reported to the Wichita Eagle that INS authorities put Hernández across the border at El Paso, Texas under "voluntary departure" on December 28. The liquor store proprietor chose not to comment on the case nor to testify that the officer had, in fact, initially assaulted Hernández. This, it was hinted, was because the proprietor could have been prosecuted by police for selling beer to a minor as

Hernández was only 18; yet, apparently, no money had yet changed hands at the time of the altercation. Hispanic leaders expressed the view that the Hernández incident was not isolated. Spokesmen Richard López, James Apodaca, and Philip León stated that illegal searches, trumped-up arrests, and physical abuse were frequently visited by police upon Wichita Hispanics in the late 1970s and, often, the suspicion of illegal alienage was a pretext frequently used by the police. [3]

The Police Dimension. As the foregoing suggests, there is reason to believe that Wichita's Hispanics might have been sensitive about their relations with law enforcement agencies in recent years. The most difficult recent period seems to have been the late 1970s. A chronicle put together by the Wichita Eagle-Beacon in 1979 summarized the picture of such complaints by all minority groups back to 1969. [4] Accordingly, "there have been 26 alleged episodes of police abuse against blacks, Hispanics, and whites." [5] One of the worst such incidents involved the death of Freida White, a deranged black woman who attacked a police officer with a knife. The Urban League protested the killing as "trigger-happiness" and claimed the Wichita Police Department exhibited this response in a habitual and patterned way in its dealing with all minorities. [6] Another event which gained notoriety occurred at the Wheatshocker Apartments near Wichita State University where a black football team co-captain, the president of the University's black student organization, and a black off-duty Air Force officer were allegedly beaten by Wichita policemen who responded to a disturbance call. Although the former two persons were ultimately convicted of acts connected

with the incident the Air Force officer was not. His testimony was highly damaging to the Wichita Police Department in that he reported unnecessary use of potentially deadly force including the beatings he personally received. [7] But the complaints against police abuse were by no means limited to the black community.

In those same years the Wichita chapter of LULAC (League of United Latin American Citizens) was presided over by Victor Montemayor, Jr. who protested that Hispanics in Wichita were routinely treated as second-class citizens and worse than animals in some cases. [8] He further complained about local police stopping persons who "looked Mexican", demanding proof of citizenship, a practice which Montemayor contended was a violation of both state and federal law. [9] As LULAC president locally, Montemayor took action through Congress and secured the blessing of then Attorney General Bell in forcing the Wichita Police Department to end its meddling in immigration enforcement and often in violation of the rights of aliens and citizens alike. In February, 1979 Police Chief Richard LaMunyon advised Montemayor that he had taken measures to end local police involvement in such immigration matters. [10] Montemayor related that he had gone to City Hall armed with a memorandum from Attorney General Bell instructing state and local police to keep their hands off illegal aliens per se unless there was clear evidence of another crime having been committed. [11]

But things had gotten bad to the point of bitterness between Hispanics and Wichita's police. Montemayor stated categorically "if a Mexican should be drinking in a white man's bar he would routinely be lined up against the wall, searched, and often roughed up by the Wichita police." [12] Montemayor himself was once

arrested when he pretended he could not speak English, but the cops let him go when it was learned that he was also an off-duty deputy sheriff for Sedgwick County. He and James Apodaca brought 21 cases of alleged police abuse and/or brutality before the Kansas Civil Rights Commission, [13] one case being that of Montemayor's own son. He feels to this day that the Commission was instrumental in ending these civil rights abuses in the Wichita area and that the Commission proved responsive to the testimony he and Mr. Apodaca presented. The sad thing, mused Victor Montemayor, was that out of the above cited 21 cases of police brutality which indirectly involved many dozens of people only himself, his son and his colleague were willing to come forth and testify formally before the Commission. [14] His testimony gives the impression that a general racist tendency prevailed among Wichita police officers during the 1970s. In fact, according to Montemayor, police repression of minorities was S.O.P. throughout Kansas during most of the post-war years up until about 1979 when Chief LaMunyon and others put an end to it under Civil Rights Commission pressure.

The matter of who drank in whose bar seems to have been particularly sensitive, rivaled perhaps only by the matter of male-female relationships. It was reported that "during the 1950s, the police regularly enforced the prevailing mores by arresting groups of black and white persons socializing together." [15] One black witness testified that an easy way to get in trouble with the Wichita police was to let them stop you with a white woman in your car. [16] It should be noted that minority citizen animosity toward the police was not directed exclusively at white police.

Black officers in Wichita reported severe hostility towards them in black neighborhoods during the late 1970s and early 1980s. Hispanic leaders Al Hernández, Richard López, Phillip León, and others protested publicly of harrassment and brutality by the Wichita police in those same years. [17] Officers in the sheriff's office also told the Kansas Civil Rights Commission that racism against both blacks and Hispanics prevailed in their department as well as among Wichita police officers. Survey research conducted in 1973, 1974, and 1978 showed strong perceptions among black Wichitans that the local police routinely abused the non-white citizenry. [18] The Wichita Eagle commented that while some Wichita police officers were exemplary in opposing excessive force and brutality there were others who willingly used it and routinely covered it up. [19]

Hispanic Wichitans in the late 1970s often feared police reprisals if they reported cases of police brutality. Phillip León, a local Hispanic attorney said he chose not to file complaints against the police, fearing he might be hounded out of his practice which is what seemed then to be happening to Chester Lewis, a black activist attorney who had challenged the police department and said he was persecuted for it. [20] Victor Montemayor related one case in which a local businessman was branded a "goddamn Mexican lover" and threatened into silence by police after witnessing an incident in which police abused an Hispanic person. [21] The angry feeling prevailed in Wichita that complaints against police and sheriff's officers weren't followed up effectively by the internal affairs sections of either department.

Perhaps the major thrust of Montemayor's advocacy was urging the City of Wichita to discipline its police officers so as to assure humane treatment for members of the minority Hispanic community. Representatives of that department who asked to remain anonymous have since pointed out that the department itself was instilling discipline in its officers well before Montemayor came into the picture. But the image of abusive police remained among many Hispanics. Testimony exists as to instances of police mistreatment of Hispanics in Wichita in those years, much of which is now in the public domain.

Victor Montemayor's own son formally charged harassment against the police before the Civil Rights Commission and related the following story. The younger Montemayor contended that on the night of February 7, 1979 he had just finished eating at a steak house on West 21st Street in Wichita and was speaking with an acquaintance in Spanish. Shortly thereafter the same acquaintance was detained in that restaurant by Officer Thomas Masters who requested to see identification and a visa. This produced a discussion between the Hispanics and Masters over who had a right to demand to see citizenship papers and whether speaking Spanish was just cause to make such a demand. The result of the encounter, according to young Montemayor's account, was verbal harassment and threats by the police officer against the Hispanics involved.[22]

When this incident was reported to the Police Department's internal affairs division by the senior Montemayor and others they stated they also suffered verbal abuse, a charge the Police Department disputes to this day. Montemayor was told by a

police spokesman, in effect, that by stopping whomever they wanted and wherever they wanted the police were doing the Mexican-American community in the north end a favor since the illegal Mexican aliens wanted to make off with local Hispanic women and take them back to Mexico.[23] Montemayor demanded that the Police Department cease this harassment of citizens of Mexican ancestry, that it stop demanding citizenship proof of people just because of their ethnic appearance, and that the matter of illegal aliens be left to the INS. A conclusion to the speech he gave before the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (February 16, 1979) conveys a sense of the bitterness which many in the Hispanic community harbored over their relationship with the Wichita Police Department at that time:

> Ladies and gentlemen, my chest cannot hold back any longer the injustices that my people are encountering at this time and age. I demand the following from the Wichita Police Dept., which I think is just under the Constitution of the USA.
> (A) Cease harassment of citizens of Mexican ancestry on the streets or places of entertainment.
> (B) To stop demanding proof of U.S. citizenship of persons of Mexican descent.
> (C) The search of illegal aliens should be handled by INS and should not be a right of the entire Wichita Police Dept.
>
> My people are afraid to come forward and complain to you today, because they are afraid of reprisals of this police officer we have talked about.
>
> Do we as U.S. citizens have to carry our birth certificates only because we are Chicanos/Mexican-Americans, and we are brown? Are the rest of the U.S. citizens required to carry and show their birth certificates? Why are we treated as second-class citizens? We pay taxes like the other citizens. Are we supposed to sit back and be pounced on? We as any rational human being will fight back for survival, through the courts of our land.
>
> Why are our pleas not listened to? Do our people have to be punished and mistreated as

> animals? Do we have human rights, like President Carter preaches to the world? Let us work within our community to better conditions for our community. Let us start with the public servants, and that encompasses the Police Dept. as well as many organizations. If it were not for us, the people of the community, the police dept. would not be employed. If we the citizens in the community were treated with respect and dignity, including Mexicans, Blacks, Whites and people of every other color, then we might be able to work in conjunction with the Police Dept. Until then, we will attempt as LULACS to do everything necessary to bring justice to and for all....
>
> As a taxpayer and President of local LULAC I demand that all Federal funding to WPD be stopped until allegations of police brutality, harassment, checking Mexican-Americans for U.S. citzenship are investigated by impartial parties. [24]

Further exchanges between LULAC and the Police Department brought about an eventual reconciliation. On March 28, 1979 Victor Montemayor Jr. wrote to Chief LaMunyon of his concern that Officer Masters might not have been transferred out of the Hispanic north district. He also protested an apparent conflict of interest in that Captain Hill, the area commander against whose officers the Hispanics had complained most vociferously, had allegedly been allowed to participate in the internal affairs investigation of his own command. [25] Nearly a month later the Chief of Police answered Montemayor. He admitted that Officer Masters had been guilty of poor judgment but could find no other firm evidence of misconduct. He added that for the benefit of everyone concerned Officer Masters was being transferred out of the Hispanic district and reassigned. [26]

Wichita Mayor Tony Casado, himself of Hispanic origin, but not active in the minority community by his own admission, convened

a meeting on April 23, 1979 intended to resolve antagonisms between the Wichita Hispanics and the police. Present were the mayor, City Manager Gene Denton, Chief of Police Richard LaMunyon and, representing LULAC, Victor Montemayor Jr. and Al Hernández. The bulk of the meeting concerned discussion of the Officer Masters episode and other allegations of serious abuses of Hispanics. At the meeting it was again confirmed that the city officials present agreed to keep Officer Masters removed from field duty in the Hispanic northside of Wichita and reassign him to a non-uniformed position in another district. The city agreed, it was reported, to keep Masters out of official contact with the Hispanic community.[27] City officials volunteered to continue to work positively with LULAC in the interest of community harmony. Mayor Casado assured that the doors to his office would be open and all agreed to keep the lines of communication open in the interest of community harmony.

Apparently the mayor's good intentions were carried to fruition. One year later it was reported that Hispanics and the police in Wichita were getting along much better, especially in contrast to the near battle conditions that had existed in 1979. Thomas Masters, the controversial officer, was still on the police force but he had been transferred to duty outside the Hispanic barrio. Captain Kerry Crisp who then commanded the Adam 1 district, including most the Hispanic community, told the local press that he was still not convinced that Masters had done all he had been accused of doing but admitted that many Hispanics believed the charges which fact, in itself, caused problems for the Police Department.[28]

It is important to note the highly favorable image which Captain Crisp gave to the broad community. According to the Eagle-Beacon, "Crisp has become a hero to politically involved Hispanics...and charges of police brutality so rampant a year ago have all but evaporated." [29] Whereas in 1979 Victor Montemayor Jr. was publicly charging the police with killing Hispanic citizens (according to the Eagle-Beacon) he was saying in the fall of 1980 that there had been a shift in police attitudes, they were trying to get to know the Hispanics better, and Montemayor was further quoted as acknowledging that "our past problems weren't with the whole police force, just with one or two officers." [30]

In fairness to the Wichita Police Department it should be noted that some of its men contributed significantly to improving community relations on an extra-duty basis. Around the Christmas season in 1979 Capt. Crisp asked Wichita's Mexican-American community for a list of 1200 needy children without regard to whether or not they were legal aliens or U.S. citizens. Then Christmas gifts were delivered by police officers dressed as Santa Claus, a gesture many Hispanics deeply appreciated. [31] But this did not isolate the police from involvement in conflicts within the Hispanic community which were not blamable on racism or harassment. Illegal aliens from Mexico continued to transport their feuds from home to Wichita and violent settlements occurred in several northside clubs. Some Mexican-Americans asked for increased police intervention in the early 1980s in the light of these killings. Such requests if regularly honored were certain to embroil the police in difficult circumstances similar to those from which they had just extricated

themselves. The fact was that many Mexican-Americans resented these peons from the "old country" whose habits and lifestyle could easily be seen as a disgrace when transplanted into the United States. The press commented that feelings ran deep over this issue in the early 1980s, "that illegal aliens give Wichita's Hispanics a bad name." [32]

We interviewed Kerry Crisp (now at the rank of major) in 1984 about contemporary police relations with the Hispanic community. He affirmed "there is still a tremendous communication gap between the police and the Hispanic community" and added that the Wichita Police Department now has a number of Spanish-speaking officers, some of whom are Hispanics, and they tend to be the most resented in the community, an unfortunate but practical fact of life. These are also the officers, ironically, who the Department most often calls upon to build its good community relations. He said that at present the Wichita Police Department is collecting a data base of felony information that would support a request for establishing an INS (Immigration and Naturalization Service) office in Wichita. He believes that bringing the INS permanently into Wichita would force the illegal aliens out of the area, perhaps to Texas or back to Mexico, and would help separate the local police role of law enforcement from federal immigration enforcement. [33]

Concerning other causes of friction among the Hispanic community that might affect the demand for police services, Crisp stated that the animosity between Hispanics and blacks over job competition in the construction, packinghouse and other fields has now come to involve Southeast Asians who often undercut both goups. But th

tense relationships between police and Hispanics that once existed are now gone. According to Crisp one reason is changes in the immigration regulations which prevent local police from asking individuals to prove their identity only on the basis of looks or suspected illegal alienage unless the person in question is also suspected of a crime. To ask for someone's I.D. without articulable facts on which to base suspicion of a crime would today constitute harassment. On the other hand, Crisp admits that the Department has continued to work closely with leadership people in the Hispanic community like Victor Montemayor Jr. to promote good relationships and says this has been largely successful. Crisp seems to feel that at the height of the trouble during 1978-1979 it was the attempts of his officers to enforce U.S. immigration laws that led to most of the difficulty. [34]

The Police Department is cognizant of the potentially explosive social conditions which illegal aliens create within the Hispanic community. Crisp estimated that in 1984 there were between 12,000 and 15,000 undocumented workers in the Wichita area. "When officers are called into this area they have encountered situations where there were bedrooms with as many as eight bunk beds in one room to accommodate these people." [35] As tightly knit as the Hispanic ghetto seems to be it is not surprising that considerable interpersonal conflict would occur, but at the same time many of these crimes go unreported because the illegal aliens seek to keep themselves out of the regular criminal justice system.

A final note is due concerning alleged police abuse of aliens. U.S. attorney's offices are charged with prosecuting cases where

individuals were deprived:

> under color of any law...of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States on account of such inhabitant's being an alien or by reason of his color or race. [36]

Whereas the city manager, chief of police, and local district attorney all insisted in the late 1970s that black and Hispanic groups were content, in principle, with police services in Wichita, the overwhelming weight of Civil Rights Commission testimony and newspaper investigations considered herein would cause one to conclude the contrary. Blacks and Hispanics were not satisfied with their relations with local law enforcement establishment and felt they had been rebuffed when petitioning an end to police abuses. [37] The Commission further concluded that police abuses were routinely tolerated and even condoned by supervisory personnel in both the police and sheriff's departments operating in the Wichita area during these years.

But those grim circumstances seemed to have changed drastically and for the better. We were assured in 1984 by police spokespersons that the Wichita Police Department has an active internal program against racism, that it works concertedly to ensure lawful behavior on the part of its officers, and that it promotes humane treatment of all persons under its jurisdiction.

The INS Dimension. As we have just seen, the question of illegal aliens in Wichita is sensitive and often distressing to that community's Hispanic population. This is because of the likelihood that U.S. citizens with Mexican ethnic features may be confused as illegals; on a number of occasions such confusion appeared deliberate, leading to abuse of Hispanics by the local police. The INS, Immigration and Naturalization Service, which is solely authorized to handle the illegal alien problem, constitutes another source of sensitivity and often resentment for Wichita Hispanics. INS does not maintain a field office in Wichita as of this writing. The nearest such facility is the INS headquarters in Kansas City, Missouri. A small field office is maintained in Garden City, Kansas, and its principal charge is handling illegal aliens, most of them migrant farmworkers from Mexico. There has been a feeling for a number of years in law enforcement circles that Wichita needs a field office both to deal with the documentation needs of legal resident aliens, and for area control operations against illegal migrants.

One area of sensitivity for local Hispanics has been INS raids which dislocate and even break up families, a process also affecting many local friendships. The matter has grown to be especially bitter during the 1980s, since several thousand Vietnamese refugees have been relocated in Wichita. They enjoy both legal status and welfare benefits. By denying such amenities to persons of Hispanic origin who have an equally plausible claim to refugee status, it is felt that all Hispanics are being stigmatized by the example of rejection.

A related source of consternation for local Hispanics involves members of their own ethnic group who become INS officers and participate in immigration law enforcement against their ethnic kin. One such case

was that of Jesus Martinez, who once told the Wichita press that if he were living in the city and wanted to make money illegally he would do it by selling fake Social Security cards, driver's licenses, and birth certificates to illegal aliens. Said Martinez, "in two years I'd have a business worth $2 million, and that's no laughing matter."[37] The same Martinez was also mentioned as controversial during interviews with some Hispanic leaders who branded him as inhumane and even brutal in his approach to the detention of illegal aliens. According to one Hispanic leader, it was pressure from the Mexican-American component of the community which finally got Martinez transferred out of the Wichita area.[38]

Estimates, without documentation by INS officials, during 1980, put the probable number of illegal aliens in Wichita at between 10,000 and 15,000.[39] If this is true, the illegal population would have then surpassed the census total of some 9,000 persons of Hispanic origin in Wichita in the same year. To explain the concentration of illegal aliens in Wichita during 1980, the then director of the INS office in Kansas City gave the existence of an established Spanish-speaking community as one drawing feature. Richard Henshaw also listed the tradition of employing Mexicans plus Wichita's 700-mile plus proximity to Mexico as causal factors.[40] In the preceding chapter, we established the historical roots of Mexican migration into Kansas generally. Continued clandestine migration seems to be the prime factor in expanding the size of the overall Hispanic population in the state, as shown in our Wichita study. But it is not at all clear what proportion of the clandestine migrants actually become permanent residents.

How the new immigrants behave themselves also concerns Wichita's Hispanics. Misbehavior frequently lands illegal aliens in policy custody from where they are turned over to INS jurisdiction. Mexicans are known to bring their feuds with them from Mexico, and often their weapons as well. INS officials note that interpersonal conflict and the old "macho ways" imported from Mexico are common reasons for alien apprehension.[41] In May of 1980, two men were killed in a gun fight outside a northside club in Wichita. The next day, the club's 53-year-old owner became sick and subsequently died of a stroke.[42] In 1984, a number of similar incidents occurred throughout the Hispanic community, many of which were never formally reported to the police. The present author was told that it is customary for the aliens to try to care for their own wounded even to the extreme of driving them back to Mexico rather than risking detention by going to local health services with gunshot wounds.

Another concern is how the new immigrants are treated by the established Hispanics themselves. Al Hernandez, editor of the bilingual monthly newspaper, El Perico, says that it is common for illegal Mexican aliens to be charged high rental fees for shabby accommodations, and that some Wichita Mexican-Americans charged "undocumented workers" for rides, thereby taking advantage of those without cars and driver's licenses. He also acknowledged the allegation that some Mexican-American-owned restaurants paid poor wages to illegal alien workers.[43] The same complaint was confirmed by spokesperson Richard Noriega, who cited specific examples for this writer of Hispanic-owned businesses, restaurants in particular, which abused undocumented employees even to the extreme of working the people and not paying them anything under threat of disclosure to the INS. The interviews conducted by this author among numerous Hispanics in

Wichita gave the impression that Hispanic-owned restaurants sometimes were rather nefarious places where treatment of illegal alien employees was concerned. One Hispanic leader even pointed out somewhat wryly that at Christmas time the most generous owner of a Mexican-style restaurant in Wichita turned out to be a "gringo."

How any new Hispanic immigrant is treated by the Wichita community as a whole usually depends upon his/her access to the job market and to needed social and health services, topics to be treated presently. But whether the immigrant alien is able to remain in the community long enough to generate an income and require such services will depend on that person's relationship with the INS. Legal resident aliens will have no difficulty, providing they live within the terms of their visas and travel to Kansas City as necessary to work out such problems as may occur. Illegal aliens will probably be deported, of course, if they are apprehended. The Immigration and Naturalization Service has a scattered recent history of enforcement activities in the Wichita area. Some illegal aliens experience little more than annoyance at being detained and sent back to Mexico, like Fernando Rivas who got his picture in the paper in 1973 after telling authorities that it would take him about one hour to come back once they put him across the border.[44] For others, especially those with families, the experience would be traumatic. Interrupting established family and friendship ties when people are gathered up in a night raid and shipped south of the border has to be extremely painful.

Until the events of 1979 that were discussed in the preceding section, it was apparently standard practice in Wichita for local police to arrest illegal aliens and hold them for federal immigration authorities. In

March, 1970, some 22 Mexican citizens were arrested in Wichita by a contingent of 12 Kansas City-based INS agents. Local police noted that this was the first time in more than 15 years that the INS had made so concentrated a raid, saying that "usually arrests are made by local officers and the aliens are held for the immigration authorities."[45] In that year, the tone of Mexican-American leaders was moderate, even to the point of being meek, if one is to believe the comments of Hispanic spokesperson Gilbert Gutierrez. He was quoted as saying that even though the alien arrests caused an inconvenience for native Hispanics, this would still benefit the Mexican-American community by freeing up jobs which the deported aliens held.[46] Some 200 illegal Mexican aliens were apprehended in Kansas during July and August of 1970 in what was described by INS officials as the heaviest infiltration of Mexican nationals into the state since 1954. Lloyd Rosander, of the Kansas City INS office, stated that a terrible drought affecting agriculture in Mexico was forcing Mexicans northward in unusually large numbers.[47] Those aliens, he said, were finding jobs in junk yards, foundries, concrete plants, and construction companies in Wichita, Kansas City, and Omaha.

Midway in the 1970s the Immigration Service had a small contingent of five enforcement officers to police eastern Kansas and western Missouri.[48] This left, almost by default, a burden on local enforcement agents which they handled with varying degrees of dedication and usually with notable inefficiency until 1979 when Attorney General Bell declared immigration enforcement to be the exclusive province of INS. The INS then covered western Kansas with a two-agent field office in Garden City. Occasionally they got support from enthusiastic local law enforcement officers like Finney County Sheriff Grover Craig who once mounted his own campaign against the illegal aliens found in the Garden City area.[49]

The same Sheriff Craig could claim one of the very few successful prosecutions in Kansas of an employer who knowingly hired illegal aliens. This involved a farmer in western Kansas who rehired a Mexican national previously expelled from the country as an illegal alien after being apprehended in that farmer's employ. Kansas has had on the books since 1973 a law making it illegal to knowingly hire an illegal alien, but the task of proving knowingly has meant that the law has almost never been enforced nor anyone prosecuted.

In April, 1978, a group of 21 illegal Mexican aliens were apprehended near Conway Kansas at a plant construction site belonging to a Tulsa, Oklahoma, based firm. At that point so many illegal aliens were being picked up in Kansas that spokesperson Richard Henshaw said many of them were turned loose with papers showing they had agreed to voluntary departure from the country within a fixed time. Others were given transportation to the Mexican border. Henshaw said that some 900 illegal aliens had been picked up in Western Kansas alone during 1977 and that he knew where "we could pick up another thousand aliens over three or four weeks if we just had the manpower."[50] The following year saw illegal aliens become a special problem for the Wichita Police Department as related in the previous section. Police spokesmen Al Thimmesch and Mike Hill stressed the need to set up an INS office in Wichita to take the pressure of handling illegal aliens off their department.[51] Congressman Dan Glickman and senators Robert Dole and Nancy Kassebaum wrote to INS Commissioner David Crosland urging creation of a Wichita INS office. In addition to the problems of illegal aliens, they gave as reasons the increase in Wichita's Indochinese refugee population and the need of local aircraft factories to process foreign visitors who arrived directly by plane in Wichita.

Most Hispanics we interviewed in Wichita would just as soon avoid setting up an INS office here in the city. They have an especially acute dilemma. On the one hand they know that, as U.S. citizens, they are bound to uphold

the constitution of the nation and honor the laws promulgated under its aegis. On the other hand when they see the immigration laws being enforced most stringently against persons of their own ethnic background (a bitter dilemma especially for Mexican-Americans) and at the same time witness Vietnamese and others welcomed as refugees, they cannot help but feel slighted. Why can't refugee Hispanics from Mexico and Central America be treated in the U.S.A. just as well as the Vietnamese, they inquire? Making matters worse is the perception in the Mexican-American community that the INS goes beyond its authority and often injects racism into applied law enforcement. Several years back Garden City, Kansas, residents protested loudly the harrassment by INS officers of anyone who had brown skin. The Reverend Ben Picazo, Director of the United Methodist Western Kansas Mexican-American Ministries in Garden City, said that immigration officers were exercising their powers beyond reasonable limits.[52] AL Lopez of Garden City said people were being questioned on the street like common thieves. INS officers in Garden City responded that if persons were questioned who spoke no English, there was good cause to then ask for a "green card", possession of which would imply legal alien status.[53] Just why and how the initial questioning began was obscured in the debate, but Hispanics in Wichita seemed to have had cause for sensitivity.

Between the U.S. citizen Hispanics and the illegal Mexican aliens, there is also discord that frequently erupts in cultural disharmony, even social violence. Culturally many citizen Hispanics exploit and deprecate the illegal Mexicans as we have variously observed in the foregoing pages. Violence has been an extreme manifestation of the cultural void, often as a result of competition for jobs, the outcome of gambling, frustrated sports competition or amorous personal relationships. The assistant city manager of Hutchinson, Kansas, Joe Palacios, once stressed the existence of such cultural differences

between Mexican-Americans and immigrant Mexicans, saying "many of the problems begin because of friction between men over women."[54]

A final source of tension for Wichita's Hispanics has to do with the dramatic increase over the past ten years in the overall Hispanic community itself and at once, an equally dramatic increase in the population of Asians. Most of the increase among both ethnic categories is owing to immigration, much of it illegal in the case of the Hispanics and nearly all of it by legal refugees in the case of the Asians. An Eagle-Beacon report in 1981 contended:

> The 1980 census shows the state's Hispanic population rose 35.5 percent and Wichita's Hispanic population 42.1 percent since 1970; Asians increased 321.7 percent statewide, and nearly sixfold in Wichita during the same period. The Asian category was broadened in the 1980 census, but the Hispanic population may actually be far larger.[55]

Richard Henshaw of the Kansas City office of INS reported increases in "backlash" resulting from the accelerated immigrant input into Kansas and said complaints from Americans generally were up over losses of jobs to the foreign worker influx. Also reported was significant irritation in the Mexican-American and black communities over governmental favoritism toward Indochinese immigrants resulting in those people taking jobs away from blacks and Chicanos. These tensions were heightened by unfounded rumors to the effect that Indochinese refugees were exempt from paying taxes.[56]

Illegal aliens who are apprehended and sent back to their country of origin have usually committed only a misdemeanor by their illegal entry or EWI (entered without inspection) in official INS terminology. Often they are given time to work out their personal matters and sign an agreement to return to Mexico under voluntary departure within a specified time limit. Mexican alien men without families are normally sent back to the border in

special buses if EWI is their only offense. Those charged with repeated violations, or with alien or narcotics smuggling, or who have resisted arrest, or those found carrying arms, may be treated more severely. Agent Richard Henshaw stated the policy of INS in 1983 in so far as Kansas operations were concerned:

> "We try to treat these people with respect, as people, not just as alien objects. They are given an opportunity to take care of their belongings and personal business and depart the U.S. within 30 days. If they fail to depart, the next time we come in contact with them, we don't treat them that way.[57]

The pressure of illegal alien traffic through Kansas promises continued tensions for Hispanics in Wichita, both in relation to the cultural gap between established Mexican-Americans and newcomers, and in-so-far as INS operations here have impact on the community.

Reportedly in June of 1984, Liberal, Kansas, had become a crossroads for illegal alien traffic and Wichita was also a well-established point in the underground railroad leading northeast. INS agents out of Garden City (whose area inclues Liberal) picked up 132 illegal aliens in May, 1984, that figure being twice the apprehensions reported exactly two years previously.[58] Illegals are plentiful in the warm weather months using the Southern Pacific Railroad's Cottonbelt route which connects El Paso, Texas with Chicago and crosses through the middle of Kansas. In winter, illegals are found hiding in empty diesel-engine cars and in summer even inside new automobiles with the air-conditioning running. Railroads alone apprehended 60,592 illegal aliens during 1983.[59] Obviously this presents major problems for the railroads as well as for local law enforcement agencies in Kansas that often are called upon to take such aliens into temporary custody.

There are inducements for migrant Mexican aliens to stay in Kansas. Although the state's farm economy has become increasingly mechanized, there still remains a big seasonal labor demand for manual work in the western beet-fields. Packing houses, construction companies, restaurants, and other service industries employ illegal aliens throughout the state. Passage and enforcement of the Simpson-Mazzoli Bill that was before Congress in 1983 and 1984 could eventually dry up those employment sources. But there is still the basic socio-economic reality that keeps the migrants coming. Mexico has nearly 50 percent unemployment in its labor force, a stagnant economy, over half of its total population is under 21 years of age, and it supports a corrupt political system that seems perennially unable to bring about reform. The three dollars per day which the illegal alien could earn by staying home in Mexico is less than the minimum hourly wage in the United States. That is why the Mexicans keep coming to Kansas, especially since an ample foothold has already been established here for them. Break that foothold, dry up the employment, and the immigration will likely stop or be drastically reduced. What will then become of Mexico the nation is a separate question; and whether Mexico would also then continue importing Kansas wheat and corn is another.

The INS point of view is that it has a mandate to apprehend illegal aliens and remove them from the country to the extent that its underfunded budget permits. In practical local terms that means that INS has no office in Wichita and makes only about one raid in Kansas' largest city per year. That event for 1984 occurred in September. Ron Sanders, district director of INS in Kansas City, said that 58 out of 75 suspects were arrested in Wichita in connection with tips that they were involved in the illegal receipt of welfare payments.[60] We interviewed officials of SRS, the Kansas Social and Rehabilitation Services, which processes

applications for welfare in the state. Their Wichita staff told us that for many years it has been standard practice for SRS to report suspected illegal aliens to the INS in cases of food stamp applications. But only since May of 1984 had SRS also been reporting those who applied for aid to dependent children and other welfare benefits. This was because of an order originating at their state headquarters in Topeka.[61] It was noted that the food stamp program is exclusively federally funded whereas the other welfare programs use shared state-federal funding. SRS officials in Wichita stated categorically that they had not responded to any specific INS request for information in connection with the September immigration raid, other than routine notification of welfare applications by suspected illegal aliens.

The September 1984 raid took place while research for this study was in progress and the author had ample opportunity to witness its impact on diverse members of the Hispanic community. Indeed, I was in the midst of focused interviews with Spanish-speaking Mexican immigrants and these were adversely affected by the fact of the raid. The event impacted negatively throughout the Wichita Hispanic community as it was widely believed that children of Mexican aliens were taken out of school by INS officers and involuntarily returned to Mexico. This version was disputed by INS as we shall presently see. Also it was rumored that some children had been temporarily jailed in Wichita. Local SRS officials said such action would have been blatantly illegal in Kansas, despite the alienage of the children. As we shall also see, it is sometimes difficult in studying this phenomenon to sort out what is believed from what really happened. Oftentimes, what is believed and acted upon is the most important.

The poignancy of Hispanic sensitivities over relationships with INS is dramatized by the immigration raid of September, 1984. The event brought Mexican-Americans, Cubans, Puerto Ricans, and other Hispanic subgroups together in a common bond of felt resentment. What is clear is that an INS raid did occur and that approximately 50 persons suspected of being illegal Mexican aliens were taken out of the Wichita area. What else happened is not so clear.

A teacher at one Wichita elementary school, herself an Hispanic, was interviewed by our research associate, Sherri Bayouth. The teacher, called here Ms. Aldama, asked to remain anonymous.[62] She is a U.S. citizen and stated the circumstances under which a child, believed to be a U.S. citizen, was taken from her classroom. The teacher witnessed two INS officers with the child's mother in their custody in the school's office explaining that she lacked proper documentation to be in the United States and that the woman had come to pick up her children. Ms. Aldama does not know if the INS agents asked for the children, only that the mother ostensibly had done so. Apparently, according to Ms. Aldama, the Mexican mother was accused of pretending to be a single mother with a U.S. citizen child and was receiving welfare benefits for the child on that basis despite the fact that the father lived in the home and was employed in Wichita. This, it should be repeated, is what Ms. Aldama understood from the conversation she witnessed, the remarks made to her by the INS agents, and as she subsequently told it to our researcher.

Ms. Aldama quietly told the little boy being sought to get his crayons and rug because his mother was taking him out of school. This was done quietly so as not to disturb the other children who were involved in other activities in the room. The following day, five children did not show up for school. Ms. Aldama called them at home to find out if

they were ill, which they were not. The parents were very nervous about sending their children back to school out of fear the INS would come again. Ms. Aldama explained to them that it was unlikely their children would be affected if no one in the family had applied for welfare. Within a few days these children started returning to class. They showed little anguish, but no one knows how much their parents suffered. Ms. Aldama believes that over half the students in her elementary class are here without legal documentation and the percentage of illegal alien parents is surely even greater. She does not care about their citizenship, however, or their lack of a birth certificate. Ms. Aldama says she only wants to help the children learn if they really want to do so.

One of the students in Ms. Aldama's class changed her name from one semester to the next because she had assumed earlier the name of a deceased girl who left a birth certificate from Texas. This was used to get into the United States and must have put a considerable strain on a six-year old child. Ms. Aldama describes most of the migrant Mexicans as pleasant, hard-working people who never look the teacher in the eye when they talk to her, this out of deference, a cultural trait bred into them at home in Mexico. In turn, their offspring are usually quite shy in the classroom. The teacher does not want to place herself in between the parents and the INS. But sometimes the parents confide in Ms. Aldama, like telling her that during the INS raid many families gave each other places to hide while immigration agents searched neighboring dwellings. Ms. Aldama also picked up the rumor, reported to our researcher, Sherri Bayouth, about a certain woman believed to be of Caribbean origin who was bilingual and frequently helped interpret for Hispanics needing to make welfare applications. The woman's residence was described and she was alleged

to be working clandestinely for the INS in Wichita, i.e., the person who tipped off INS to the identities of those illegal aliens who had applied for welfare.[63]

One of the Hispanic community's most prominent leaders told this writer she knew of cases when whole families of Hispanics suspected of illegal alienage had been jailed, that is children and mothers put in the same jail cell, and that abundant testimony could be had from the Spanish-speaking community to support this provided that confidentiality were maintained. Jailing of Hispanic children was not new, she said, in Sedgwick County. The same spokesperson stated categorically her belief that Hispanic children had also been jailed, albeit temporarily, during the September 1984 INS raid in Wichita.[64]

In addition it is alleged that INS called the offices of CPS, Child Protective Services in Wichita about a week before the raid and requested accommodations for children who would be taken into custody with their parents. Nedra Clark is the director of CPS, a subdivision of Social and Rehabilitation Services and one of her assistants allegedly received the call from INS. Apparently CPS could not provide housing for the children at the time of the raid unless it could be demonstrated that child-neglect or abuse had occurred and such was not the case. So the help of the United Methodist Urban Ministries of Wichita was sought. The church group's principal outreach worker, Mitzi Rivera, contacted the county jail whereupon she was told that the children were <u>at</u> the jail, but not <u>in</u> it. Ms. Rivera apparently found it hard to make this distinction.[65]

We will not go on ad infinitum trying to unravel the intricacies of this story. Suffice it to say that the Hispanics of Wichita feel a measure of outrage that members of their ethnic group are treated as

undesirables while ethnics of other minorities are routinely welcomed into the United States under refugee status. Locally, there is a prevailing view among leadership elements of Wichita's Hispanic community that taking Mexican children out of school and detaining them, irrespective of bureaucratic verbal niceties ("at" or "in" the jail) constitutes a slur against Hispanics generally and toward Mexican-Americans specifically. The Hispanics of Wichita further tend to believe that the INS came into the community seeking to take children out of school, regardless of the fact that some of them may have been U.S. citizens whose parents could have been illegals, and that it would have been more humane public policy to have allowed these children to at least complete their semester before sending them and their parents back to Mexico.

We asked the Immigration and Naturalization Service for its interpretation of the September, 1984 events. A somewhat different story was related by INS spokesman Ron Sanders who spoke with our research associate Phil Alldritt shortly after the raid in question. Sanders described a four-day operation in Wichita involving three INS officers and one "clean up" officer who picked up payroll checks to give to the detained aliens and helped them straighten out some personal affairs before their being returned to Mexico. Sanders stated that the Wichita Police Department was not notified prior to this particular raid while admitting that in some cases such notification of local authorities is given. In the September, 1984 operation, some 75 persons of illegal alienage and believed to have been involved in welfare fraud were targeted for detention and possible deportation. In two days, 58 of that number were apprehended. The remainder of the suspects went underground. Of the 58 detained, 25 elected to waive their right to a hearing and to accept voluntary departure to Mexico without further prosecution. The remaining 33 requested hearings before an immigration

judge.[66]

Sanders was emphatic that his agents did not go to Wichita to pick up children and that no children were taken out of school unless the parents requested it. Some parents did so request rather than leave their children behind as wards of the state should they be returned to Mexico. He said that in most cases Mexican aliens will elect to take their U.S. citizen children with them and stressed that it is the policy of INS to try to keep families together, that INS considers it more important to keep children with their parents than to stress citizenship rights of children born in the U.S.A. to illegal alien parents (it should be noted that if children are so alienated from the U.S. by going with their parents, they must wait until they are 21 years old to file immigrant petitions on behalf of those parents, thus merely getting across the border to have a baby does not guarantee citizenship here for the parents involved).

INS contends that the Wichita operation saved some 50,000 dollars in potential welfare fraud violations. Mr. Sanders told Phil Alldritt the tip they received leading to the apprehensions in Wichita came from a disillusioned girlfriend whose man had left her for another woman who was herself committing welfare fraud. Thus the rejected girlfriend allegedly took revenge by informing the INS. Sanders says this is a very common occurrence and that the "wets" frequently turn each other in. He declined to say whether reports from SRS about welfare fraud had also figured in the planning of the September raid. Another common source of tips, added Sanders, is workers who have been laid off a job and who believe they have subsequently been replaced with illegal aliens. He said that many times welfare agencies check out the stories of allegedly single female applicants for assistance and find there is a man living in

the home. This can also result in a special call to the INS. It should be noted that Sanders' testimony in this respect is supported by that of numerous other INS officials we have interviewed in the course of previous research efforts.

Sanders believes some of the illegal migrant pressure in Kansas will be eased by the increase in Border Patrol strength that is included in the 1985-86 budget. Should the Simpson-Mazzoli Bill pass it will undoubtedly result in an upgrading of internal enforcement meaning that an INS office will probably be set up in Wichita. Such an office would dispense both service to immigrants and enforcement efforts to control illegal aliens. The present Garden City office is, he said, all enforcement at this time. He added that out of the September 1984 operation his agents developed over 100 leads on other illegal alien cases in Wichita and he estimated that the city probably contained between 12 and 15 thousand of them in 1984.[67]

Conclusions on Hispanics and Law Enforcement Agencies. One may surmise from the foregoing that relations are far more amiable between Hispanics and local police in Wichita than is the case vis a vis the Immigration and Naturalization Service, at least at the moment of this writing. This circumstance emerges from what is perhaps an inescapable conflict of interests. On the one hand, INS is legally mandated to enforce the immigration laws. Current enforcement policy makes it appear to Hispanics that the charge of illegal alienage is brought selectively against people of Mexican and Central American origin while Cubans, Indochinese, and Eastern Europeans are granted the preferred immigrant and/or refugee status. On the other hand, Hispanics, while admitting that the national laws must be enforced, resent discriminatory selective enforcement. They resent seeing people of their own ethnic group singled out for what appears to them as persecution. One would be led to feel that nondiscriminatory enforcement and application of the immigration laws and, especially, the Refugee Act of 1980, would ease some of the Hispanic resentment. Guatemalans and Salvadorans are fleeing a political terror that is just as real as that of Poland or Viet Nam. A more flexible approach to the handling of illegal Mexican aliens would perhaps also yield good human relations benefits, especially if coupled with meaningful immigration law reform. In specific terms, it is hard to see how the public good is concretely served by interrupting the schooling of Mexican children just because their parents entered this country without documents or inspection.

Yet, inescapably, Hispanics who aid and abet the coming, going, and welfare of the clandestine migrants are contributing directly to the magnet effect which attracts more and more of them north of the border. The very existence of charitable facilities in Wichita and other cities to care for indigent migrants makes it attractive for them to keep coming. So to a real extent local Hispanics are contributing to community circumstances that can spawn

conflict and heighten community tensions; but yet who can blame them morally? After all, it is the moral mandate of churches to harbor the needy. As we shall see, that church commitment is in conflict with the legal mandate of the INS. This provides the basis for a major clash that promises to grip the American political system during the next few years.

Add to this an international dimension. Stopping, or drastically reducing the clandestine migration through passage and rigid enforcement of a renewed Simpson-Mazzoli Bill, or equivalent future legislation, would reduce migrational pressures on communities such as Wichita. But at the same time, pressures on Mexico would be increased. Since the Mexican political system seems incapable of responding to the needs of its own citizenry, it is also unlikely to be able to absorb such pressures. Social and political revolution could come to Mexico. And there are a legion of interests within the United States alone wishing to avoid such a development, especially for the baneful effect it would probably have on our economy. It is doubtful, for instance, whether Kansas agriculture is yet ready to do entirely without migrant Mexican labor. Nor would Kansas care to lose Mexico as a wheat customer either!

Meanwhile the complications from clandestine migration continue unabated. Neither the federal nor state governments will subsidize the services required to absorb the needy migrants. Local governments cannot do so because of state and federal restrictions (with a few exceptions such as child neglect and education). By and large the needy migrants who come to rest here in Wichita must depend on private agencies, principally churches, to keep them from destitution. In the section to follow we will consider one such church program in Wichita. It is probably the most prominent example of private response to the impact of, and needs generated by, clandestine Hispanic migration into this area.

Medical Services for Wichita's Hispanic Needy

The Founding of "Mi Casa Su Casa." The founding story of today's Hispanic Clinic in Wichita illustrates that community's ability to adapt to a critical social need that was created by the input of Spanish-speaking immigrants. Originally known as "Mi Casa Su Casa" (my house is your house) the beginning years of the enterprise were described by Tomasa Gonzalez and Rachel Rubalcava.[68]

In 1977, these two Hispanic women, natives and residents of Wichita, reacted to a developing health care deficiency which held threatening potential for a major public health crisis. Many Spanish-speaking women about Wichita's north-central barrio were observed in advanced stages of pregnancy and without medical care. This was partly because of the language barrier and partly for financial reasons. A common practice up until that year in Wichita had been for such women to wait out their entire pregnancy without medical guidance and in the end simply throw themselves onto the mercy of a hospital emergency room for delivery. Wichita hospitals were increasingly vocal about the maternity costs they were forced to absorb as a result of the dilemma in which indigent Spanish-speaking mothers found themselves. Tomasa and Rachel took an important initiative in bringing this state of affairs to the attention of others in the Hispanic community. Their overriding fear was that expectant mothers would eventually be turned away from emergency rooms under precarious circumstances and that human tragedies would follow.

But there were other health concerns. Young children of Spanish-speaking parents often went without vaccinations due to their parents' English language problems and also because of finances. It was often possible in those years to get limited food stamp aid for needy children even though their parents might not be U.S. citizens. In this way

malnutrition was avoided for many of the young. But hunger did occur, especially when small food stamp allocations were divided among larger families and when the needy were afraid to apply for assistance lest their alienage be questioned. It was apparent in 1977 that public welfare programs would not be available for most of Wichita's Spanish-speaking needy. This fact had major public health implications and challenged the private sector's welfare initiative.

It was the idea of Tomasa and Rachel to approach the Catholic Church via Our Lady of Perpetual Help in north Wichita. But there they got little early encouragement. Next they tried the United Methodists and got a positive response from Reverend Chuck Chipman of St. Paul's United Methodist Church. With his help they opened a clinic in that Methodist Church's facility during the summer of 1977. By this time, they had gotten significant supporting contributions from other concerned groups including money from the Sisters of the Most Precious Blood. Three local hospitals provided limited laboratory and personnel services. Dr. Francisco Gonzalez, an oncologist, began attending indigent Spanish-speaking clients at the clinic on a once-a-month basis. The early clinic's operation was genuinely ecumenical with many churches contributing. It continued to be known as "Mi Casa Su Casa."

The clinic's early operating budget was estimated by Tomasa Gonzalez at from 8 to 10 thousand dollars in 1978 considering the value in kind of all the services and medicines that were donated in addition to subventions from the various church congregations. Tomasa, who was then employed as a social worker with Planned Parenthood, recruited a number of volunteers including Connie Mullenix, an instructor at St. Joseph's School of Nursing, who designed the clinic's patient flow and Spanish-speaking accompaniment systems. Over 100 kids were vaccinated during

the first six months of the clinic's operation. Tomasa remembers that several babies were born in that time period; several workshops were held on such themes as health and hygiene, nutrition, and landlord-tenant relationships. Vaccines and vaccination forms were provided by the County Health Department. Other public agencies were approached for the possibility of posting regulations in Spanish and the clinic's volunteer directors made an effort to increase the general awareness in Wichita of the presence of a growing Spanish-speaking subculture. The local branch of the American Diabetes Association gave the clinic a pamphlet to distribute; but this, unfortunately, turned out to be written in Italian. Nevertheless, their good will was much appreciated and community awareness grew. Planned Parenthood conducted a series of weekly birth control workshops for the clinic with no overt religious opposition from any sector.

In January, 1978, the clinic began seeing patients twice a month. It was still run by Tomasa, Rachel, and several volunteers who handled an estimated average of 18-20 patients per clinic session. An advisory board oversaw the clinic's work with Reverend Chipman working as an enthusiastic board member. Among his colleagues on the board were Wesley Minister Donna Copper, Leonard Cowan who was Urban Ministries Director, and Barbara Upp , a St. Paul Methodist intern. In the summer of 1978, the operation expanded to include a church school for Spanish-speaking kids who came primarily from the bilingual programs at Park and Horace Mann schools. The following newspaper editorial gave an indication of the public image of the clinic as of early 1978.

Editorials

4A WICHITA BEACON Tuesday, September 12, 1978

Help for Spanish-speaking a sign of people who care

In an age when most social service programs are highly organized and institutionalized and require regular fund-raising efforts, Mi Casa Su Casa Clinica and the additional activities it has inspired stand out as a splendid demonstration of what can be achieved solely with concern, cooperation and volunteer effort.

The clinic, whose name comes from a common Spanish idiom denoting welcome — "My house is your house" — was set up to provide free health care for Spanish-speaking Wichitans who can't afford to pay for medical attention, and for some reason can't qualify for public assistance programs.

St. Paul's United Methodist Church provides space and sponsorship for the twice-a-month clinic program, which has come to involve several physician volunteers, the nurse wife of one of them, three church-related hospitals (two of them Catholic), Friends University's Spanish department, the United Methodist Wichita Urban Ministry and Wesley UM Church, from whose neighborhood many patients come. Two other churches are involved in a spin-off program.

St. Paul's got involved after a neighbor pointed out the need to Pastor Chuck Chipman. He saw the program as an ideal project for multilingual Barbara Upp, a Texas theological seminary student, who recently spent most of a year in in-service training here.

Spanish-speaking Dr. Francisco Gonzalez became the volunteer coordinator of medical services, his wife, Mary, became the clinic nurse, and St. Francis, St. Joseph and Wesley hospitals helped by donating clinic equipment, laboratory services and, when needed, free patient care.

A Friends student majoring in both Spanish and religion got involved as an interpreter and now a new cooperative work education course will enable her to earn credits for her work in both the clinic and a released-time weekday church school program. The latter serves Spanish-speaking Wichita grade school pupils, about 100 of whom attend Park School.

Several other Friends students have been assigned by their teacher, Mrs. Jerry Smart, to do outreach work among Spanish-speaking shut-ins.

And since Mi Casa Su Casa has done so well serving non-English-speakers of Spanish descent, agencies have referred to it a number of residents of Wichita's new Vietnamese community. It now is seeking volunteers fluent in Vietnamese.

The weekday school's coordinator is associate pastor of another church — Rev. Gary Harms of East Heights UM, who once lived in Chile. And bus transportation for pupils is provided by First Presbyterian Church, which has its own classes for English-speaking Park students.

All of which shows what can happen when a seed is planted to solve a community need, and other concerned people of good will get involved.

Bien hecho, Mi Casa Su Casa.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In midyear 1978 some policy differences began to emerge among those responsible for the clinic. Volunteers were, of course, unpaid as were Tomasa and Rachel who continued to serve as co-directors. Both were Catholics and believed that the fact of the clinic being located within a prominent Methodist Church facility was in itself an adequate and well-deserved recognition for that religious group's contribution. But other churches, both Catholic and Protestant, were also contributing. The two founders therefore objected to any given religious group distributing its religious tracts in or near the clinic proper. There is disagreement to this day as to who distributed what literature in or near the clinic, but apparently the Catholics and Methodists had some "falling out" over this issue. But this had nothing to do with the commitment of either group to the clinic's overall goals. The Catholic founders described their approach to medical care for the Hispanic needy as "holistic," stressing the overall betterment of one's quality of life as a precondition for eventual spiritual enrichment. They acknowledge the important contribution of the United Methodists, without which the clinic probably would not have progressed.

In the spring of 1979 Tana Fender came as a volunteer from WSU and was an excellent supporting talent whose human relations skills and drive more than compensated for the fact that she spoke little Spanish. Indeed, not all who spoke Spanish had succeeded as volunteers. These generous workers kept the clinic going as did the logistic support of St. Paul's United Methodist Church and the United Methodist Urban Ministries. Other churches continued their supporting contributions. In early 1979 the clinic's co-directos began asking for Methodist Church support to hire permanent staff beginning on a part time basis. No such aid was forthcoming. It seemed to Tomasa and Rachel that the Urban Ministries preferred to see the clinic run only by volunteers despite the significant work

burden this placed on several of the key members. They felt the Methodists were unwilling to provide financial support for permanent staff. An offer from St. Francis Hospital to absorb the entire operation and manage it never got beyond the talking stage.

Clinic management problems grew more acute in early 1980 according to the founders. Reverend Martin Holler had then assumed the executive directorship of the Urban Ministries and along with it responsibility for the Hispanic Clinic. The co-directors continued to feel over-worked and sincerely wished that the host religious institution would relieve them through financial support for additional permanent staff. Demands on the clinic were growing. In 1980 the clinic attended patients every other week at an average of twenty patients per session by the summer of that year. The budget had stayed at around $10,000 annually, but still there were no permanent staff or outreach workers to handle the demand.

After failing again to convince the Urban Ministries board that serious problems existed meriting a financial investment, the two founding members of the clinic staff formally retired from the project in the summer of 1980. At this point the Clinic's income was actually starting to decline, and the part-time use of physicians'-assistant students from W.S.U. did not adequately relieve pressures on the Clinic's two doctors, Francisco Gonzalez and Marc Vinzant. Dr. Gonzalez also left the clinic in 1980 to accept a position in another city. His departure was a major blow to "Mi Casa Su Casa."

It is the view of Tomasa Gonzalez and Rachel Rubalcava that some degree of religious bias was at least one underlying factor in their decision to give up the clinic they had founded. They feel that even the September, 1978 newspaper editorial reproduced above gave insufficient

credit to Hispanics and to Catholics for their initiative and contribution to the setting up of the clinic. And, they observe somewhat wryly, that not long after their retirement the funds appeared for permanent staff and support functions, just what they had so often requested. The Methodist view of this is that no new funding appeared, that people already on the Urban Ministries and St. Paul's Church staffs were merely reassigned to keep the clinic going.[69]

Here we see political divisiveness emerging within the established Hispanic community over how to respond to social needs created by new Spanish-speaking immigrants and over who should guide the response. Although the division took on minor religious dimensions, it seems on the positive side that no serious sectarian discord ever really developed over the issue. Today most Wichita Hispanics, regardless of their religious affiliation, endorse the work of the clinic and support it as best they can. Tomasa believes that it was far better to have the Methodists continue the clinic with their own staff rather than have it shut down out of irreconcilable differences in management philosophy. By the end of 1980 the Hispanic Clinic had grown prominently in stature and was a major recognized community resource serving the Spanish-speaking needy of Wichita. Of that the founders could be justly proud.

Clinic Expansion and Today's "Clinica Hispana." From this point the story of the clinic's growth and development is essentially as related by Martha Sanchez, Rev. Chuck Chipman, and Rev. Martin Holler.[70] At the beginning of 1980 Martha Sanchez was hired by Rev. Leonard Cowan to be director of the newly created United Methodist Hispanic Ministries, a subgroup of the broader United

Methodist Urban Ministries over which Reverend Cowan then presided. Martha began working in January on a 15-hour per week part-time basis. The Hispanic Ministries were originally meant to take a leading role in outreach work and in setting up weekday programs for Hispanic children to be held at St. Paul's Church. In addition to the 15 hours per week that Martha spent building the Hispanic Ministries, she was a full-time student in Spanish at Wichita State University and coordinated ESL (English as a Second Language) classes at St. Paul's United Methodist Church. Moreover, during the first half of 1980, she regularly lent assistance on request to Tomasa and Rachel in the clinic as the demand by needy Hispanics dictated.

In the summer of 1980 when Tomasa and Rachel retired from the clinic its management fell to Martha as the best qualified bilingual person available who had had any experience with it. She was already on the Urban Ministries payroll when the need for a change of clinic directors occurred. Martha proceeded to negotiate financial assistance for the clinic from church sources, but outside the Urban Ministries. She received Reverend Holler's support in this fund-raising activity and believes that Tomasa and Rachel would also have enjoyed his support in capturing outside financing for the clinic if it had been possible for them to stay on somewhat longer. A range of sincere personal feelings on both sides surfaced in the process of transferring the clinic's management. Fortunately all parties agreed that the clinic should go forward.

Martha Sanchez inherited the clinic with an acute shortage of patient records, and she therefore sought to develop a comprehensive system of record-keeping. The 1980 budget for the operation was approximately $10,000 in both services and financial subventions. In 1981 the clinic's name was changed to "La Clinca Suya" or "your own clinic." This name was short-lived for in that same year the Wesley Family Practice entered the picture with

supporting medical services and the clinic was then named H.P.C., or the Hispanic Patient Clinic, which today has been reduced to simply Hispanic Clinic, or Clínica Hispana. Major support was also secured from the Wesley Medical Center complex as negotiated by Reverend Martin Holler. Through a 1981 grant won by Martha Sanchez the clinic was able to hire Mitzi Rivera as principal outreach nurse, albeit on a part-time basis. A part-time ESL coordinator was also engaged to remove this burden from the director of Hispanic Ministries.

Mitzi Rivera, a Catholic and an R.N., expanded the clinic's outreach program considerably. Nutrition and pre-natal care classes began in 1981 as did home visitations by the clinic nurse. Spanish-speaking mothers were instructed in immunization, health record-keeping, and planning for school physicals. It should be kept in mind that, with few exceptions, no state or federal funds were available for these purposes and the Urban (Hispanic) Ministries carried this burden as part of its own outreach initiative. In 1982 the Clinic continued referring needy mothers and children to the federally funded WIC (Women-Infant-Children) Program through the Department of Health. Patients referred by the clinic to WIC usually required help because of anemia, malnourishment, or pre-natal educational needs. According to Tana Fender referrals to WIC had originally begun in 1979.

As of 1982 the volunteer doctors from Wesley Family Practice were coming to the clinic in the Church to attend patients each Tuesday night. Some 25 patients were seen nightly. Eventually the doctors grew fatigued by this load and were severely inconvenienced by the lack of medical supplies and equipment at the clinic's existing facilities. Martha Sanchez remembers one night when, for lack of proper materials and equipment, doctors had to tie up a broken arm with wire from a coat hanger before taking a patient to the hospital. To ease the doctors' burden, their case load was thus dropped to 20 patients per night; and in October of 1983 the Hispanic Clinic commenced sending its patients to the Wesley Family Practice offices at the Medical Center after screening them and holding nursing consultations at the church. Fortunately, someone in the Urban (Hispanic) Ministries support group donated a used station wagon which serves usefully to this day in transporting patients from the intake station at the Church to the Medical Center, a distance of about three miles. Only the eye clinic remained in the Church, and it continues there on a once-a-month basis. Fears that the Spanish-speaking Hispanic patients would suffer psychologically from being taken to the larger medical center located out of their barrio did not materialize thanks to adequate counselling.

Beginning in 1982, the clinic received additional support from the Physician's Assistant Department at Wichita State University and from the same department at Kansas Newman College. Jane Weilert of the Nursing Department at Kansas Newman had served as an advisor and regular volunteer since the clinic's earlier years, and she continued in this valuable role. Sergio Tristan joined the enterprise in November of 1983 and served as outreach coordinator and intake screening counsellor well into 1984 when

he was named Hispanic Pastor for St. Paul's United Methodist Church. Thereafter he continued to serve the clinic on a part-time basis.

As of 1984, the Hispanic Clinic limits its operations to 20 patients each Tuesday evening. Screening and counselling is done at St. Paul's United Methodist Church from 4 to 5 pm. Some patient problems can be handled there by the nursing staff. Those having confirmed appointments or being newly accepted are transported to the Wesley Family Practice located next to the Wesley Medical Center. Patients are questioned carefully as to their financial status and proof of income is often requested.[71] An effort is made to make certain the clinic's services are available only to the needy. For instance, a single person's income cannot be above $594 per month to quality, that of a family of three may not surpass $960, and a family of 7 is limited to $1,574 in monthly income in order to receive free services at the clinic. A one dollar contribution is asked of those who can afford it toward the clinic's administrative expenses. Patients are not excluded because of race, alienage, or religion. Medical need and economic necessity are the principal criteria for receipt of services of the Clínica Hispana.

Patients accepted for treatment at the clinic are expected to follow a set of rules of courtesy and conduct which are strictly enforced in the best interest of all concerned. A copy of the Spanish version of those rules appears below with a resume of its contents reserved for a footnote.[72]

United Methodist
Urban Ministry of Wichita

UNITED METHODIST HISPANIC MINISTRIES
Martha Sanchez, Director
Sergio Tristan, Outreach Coordinator
Ricardo Flores, Clinic Coordinator
Mitzi Rivera, Outreach Nurse
Lucille Noreiga, Office Aide

ATENCION A TODOS LOS PACIENTES DE LA CLINICA HISPANA

Las siguientes reglas estan ahora en efecto y se aplicarán a TODOS LOS PACIENTES de la Clinica.

1-Si el paciente pierde 2 citas ya sea para la clinica, el hospital, o con cualquiera de los trabajadores de Ministerios Hispanos, ese paciente PERDERA SUS PRIVILEGIOS como paciente de la Clinica.

2-Es resposabilidad de todo paciente mantener su información personal al día. Esto incluye: número de telefono, su dirección correcta, lugar de empleo, estado civil, etc.

3-Aquellos pacientes que traen a sus ninos les pedimos que los mantengan lo más quietos posible. Si se le llama la atención más de 2 veces perderan sus privilegios como pacientes de la Clinica Hispana.

4-Cada paciente es responsable de mantener el area de la clinica limpia y recogida. Las revistas y libros deben ser puestos en su lugar correspondientes.

Le pedimos que sigan estas reglas las cuales esperamos mejorarán el servicio que prestamos a la comunidad hispana en la ciudad de Wichita.

Gracias por su cooperacion,

Personal de Ministerios Hispanos

352 No Broadway Wichita, Kansas 67202 316-267-4201

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In addition to the nursing and outreach staff and the volunteer doctors and nurses, there are some 25 other persons who give their time freely to make the Hispanic Clinic a success. Should patients require specialized medical services, the attending doctors try to arrange treatment by specialists at Wesley Medical Center. Martha Sanchez remembers the case of an elderly woman who suffered from a childhood knee injury which threatened to make leg amputation necessary. The clinic's doctors were able to arrange for the woman to be taken on as an exceptional teaching case at Wesley Medical Center where experimental surgery eventually saved her leg and enabled her to walk with a cane. There was also the case of the 4-year-old girl with a small piece of steel in one eye. The eye clinic's volunteer staff got her accepted for immediate surgery at Wesley and the child's vision was saved free of charge. Many are the cases such as this in which highly specialized care has gone beyond the Hispanic Clinic's normal limits. The clinic does not, however, refer patients to all specialized medical areas. Patients needing follow-up attention are usually given return appointments before leaving the clinic.

Mitzi Rivera conducts home visitations as part of the clinic's outreach program. She visits all of the maternity cases which are qualified for in-patient care. Some 24 such cases are selected annually (as of 1984) according to family income and overall need. This is determined by an extensive family investigation which Mitzi and other outreach personnel conduct. Those accepted for the program are carried all the way through their pregnancy and delivery by the clinic and the Wesley Family Practice without charge to the patients. Because this is an attractive program, it is not unusual for persons unable to qualify as charity cases to attempt to secure cost-free access to Wesley Medical Center by representing themselves as accepted clinic patients when they clearly are not.

The director and staff of the Hispanic Ministries are cognizant of the fact that some persons who are unable to establish the required level of need may resent being refused attention by the Clinic; but every effort is made to place such clients with alternative public service agencies as appropriate. For non-Hispanics (who may resent the ethnic focus of the Clinic) there is another United Methodist-sponsored clinic at the corner of Broadway and Central in Wichita. Known colloquially as the "Piburn Clinic" it is more extensive in its scope of operations than is the Hispanic Clinic and can handle more people more often.[73] Spanish-speaking patients are referred to the Hispanic Clinic at St. Paul's Church simply in order to separate the bilingual health care operation in the interest of administrative convenience.

There is an additional house call program when cases appear suggesting child abuse, malnourishment, or other neglect. The Clinic has preventive medicine classes featuring advice by nurses and doctors on child care, personal hygiene, birth control, and immunization. Pre-school physicals and vaccinations are performed for patients of the Clinic. "O.B." study tours are conducted in Spanish through Wesley Medical Center to familiarize the patients with maternity procedures. Most of the above educational functions are currently performed by Mitzi Rivera. Her outreach work is facilitated by Lucille Noriega who manages the Clinic office and filing system, carries on patient follow-up and recall, and acts as a specialized Clinic translator.

Because of the Hispanic Clinic's dependence on the Wesley Medical Center complex, some consternation resulted from that facility's proposed sale to a profit-making group in 1984. Many people in Wichita, including some physicians, believed that the hospital complex had been created for

the community benefit, not for the eventual enrichment of a set of stockholders located for the most part in another state. Area congregations of Methodists demanded an active role in any decision to sell the hospital thereby temporarily sidetracking the transfer of ownership. Martha Sanchez stated her hope that the Wesley Foundation would assume a supporting role in keeping the Hispanic Clinic operating should the hospital ultimately be sold.

The Hispanic Clinic is Wichita's only comprehensive general practice facility providing charity health care to needy Spanish-speaking people. The fact that many of these are illegal aliens has not been concealed by the Hispanic Ministries' directorate and staff. Their mandate is a moral one, providing health care to those who cannot get it from private sources because they lack the ability to pay and who cannot get it from public agencies which are prevented legally from servicing illegal aliens. The aliens are, nevertheless, living human beings and it would be morally unacceptable to ignore or deny their needs. Were it not for the United Methodist operation in their behalf in Wichita, these low income Spanish-speaking people would surely become a critical public problem.

Thus the Hispanic Clinic satisfies a glaring public need which the remainder of the community is, apparently, not prepared to address. It could be argued that in a very real sense the Hispanic Clinic and its Methodist sponsors are even doing a favor for INS, the Immigration and Naturalization Service. The INS is not budgeted to provide medical attention for persons in its custody beyond basic necessities and certainly not on the scale of attention represented by the Hispanic Clinic in Wichita. Until INS is prepared to simply deport the mass of illegal aliens in Wichita or any other community, it can be thankful

their needs are being attended to by private charities. The question of how and why these people got here in the first place should of course be deferred for consideration in a different context. The immediate issue raised by the Hispanic Clinic in Wichita is merely that of humane response to critical human need.

The Reverend Martin Holler once stated the case quite openly in an interview with the Wichita press:

> There's no way I'm going to say 'Well, you're ill. I'm not going to help you.' One woman who fled to Wichita from Guatemala paid $3,000 to bring the rest of her six-member family here. . .they are living on her salary of $110 a week because her husband can't find a job. What can they do if they get sick? They're here illegally.[74]

Today's Clinic operation is impressive. One estimate places its 1984-85 output value as $100,000 plus if both services and actual budget are concerned.[75] It is truly a major feature of the total Wichita pattern of adaptation to the immigration of Spanish-speaking people into Kansas.

Educational Needs of the Spanish-Speaking Community

As new Hispanic immigrants continued to find their way into Wichita during the 1970s and 1980s, it became incumbent upon local school authorities to react decisively to the needs of Spanish-speaking children especially in the light of several Supreme Court decisions requiring bilingual education for those needing it. The Supreme Court also mandated federal funds for bilingual education. These are available to school districts under Title Seven of the Federal Bilingual Education Act. This federal funding supports teaching, materials, and transportation for students in elementary and secondary schools. Teaching is started in the child's native language until cognitive skills are firmly developed. Thereafter the second language is used for instruction.

Advocates of bilingual education believe that to immerse a child immediately in a second language without strong cognitive development in his native language will result in the child's never developing the basic learning skills he or she needs in either language. This is in contrast to the so called "sink or swim" method where no special instruction in either language is given. Students are simply dropped into a class and expected to either learn how to function on their own or else fail. This now illegal method is how many Mexican-Americans were educated in the past. A third alternative is ESL or English as a second language. Here special language instruction is given in English, the student's native language is not used as a teaching vehicle. Some bilingualists believe theirs is the more culturally well-anchored approach. ESL advocates believe they do a better job of teaching English, but without deliberately sacrificing cultural context. The "sink or swim" method is seen by many as brutal, but by some others as well worth it in terms of effectiveness. The present report, however, does not wish to cast an oar into the choppy waters of the above pedagogical controversy.[76]

Suffice it to say that the presence in Wichita of Spanish-speaking students in sizeable numbers makes some combination of the above approaches necessary if the educational process is to proceed (allowing the students to learn Spanish only is generally rejected as unacceptable, given the American cultural milieu).

ESL is the most common approach to teaching Spanish-speaking students in Wichita due to the ethnic diversity here. Bilingual education might be more widely used were Spanish the only language involved. But with Vietnamese, Cambodian, and other ethnic groups present in sizeable numbers it is difficult to find sufficient bilingual teachers who are qualified. So ESL (English as a second language) seems a more realistic alternative, at least here in Wichita. The question of how to provide instruction for the foreign born has caused a local rift among some professional educators, a point to which I shall return presently.

During the 1970s the need for bilingual education in Wichita became acute as children having no English skills kept arriving, ranging from kindergarten through high school. Placement problems occurred as these children had no alternative to going into the regular classes that naturally were taught in English. With federal funding, bilingual programs were implemented at Park and Irving elementaries, at Horace Mann Middle School, and at North High School. In 1976-77 the total enrollment in Spanish bilingual education in the Wichita Public Schools was 57; in 1977-78 it was 71, increasing to 145 in 1978-79 and 169 in 1979-1980. This involved classes from kindergarten through 12th grade. For 1983-84 the enrollment figure was 918, and this included students taking both bilingual instruction and English as a second language (ESL). The 1983-84 figure also includes languages other than Spanish.

The exact total cost of bilingual (including ESL) programs in Wichita during the 1983-84 period is unknown. But the Kansas State Bilingual Act provided some $130,050, the U.S. Department of Education provided $101,093 through its Transition Program for Refugee Children, and a Title Seven grant provided $247,876 for a special program at Park School. The above information was provided to our interviewers by school officials in Wichita.[77]

The proposed bilingual education budget for 1984-1985 is shown in the figure above. There has appeared, of course, a distinct possibility that the Wichita Board of Education would elect to reduce or even eliminate the bilingual component of the program at Park School, leaving only the ESL component functioning. A number of board members were known to be skeptical about continuing a program which supported illegal alien children. There was also speculation that the Reagan Administration was much less than enthusiastic in carrying out the Supreme Court mandate on serving the educational needs of such foreign born students.

Of the 918 students with "limited English proficiency" enrolled in the Wichita Public Schools for 1983-84, it is not known how many of them were Hispanic. For 1984-1985 the total number of bilingual and ESL students combined in the Wichita Public Schools was 742. Of this total only 143 were Hispanics and at least 90 percent of the remainder were Southeast Asians.[78] An earlier evaluation had stated only that "a substantial portion of them are Hispanic; and since the Wichita district policy does not demand proof of citizenship for education, one should assume that a major percentage of these are Mexican nationals."[79] School officials believe that the educational opportunities for the children of illegal Mexican aliens have definitely improved since the earlier waves of immigrants with children began to dramatize the need in the early 1970s. That, at least, seems to have been the Wichita

Table C

WICHITA PUBLIC SCHOOLS BILINGUAL EDUCATION BUDGET

BILINGUAL EDUCATION FUND

ACCEPTED BUDGET 1984-1985		$ 840,000.00	
Add:			
Additional amount to comply with budget and cash basis laws (45%)		378,000.00	
Less:			
Cash on hand 7/1/84		-124,801.93	
NET TOTAL REQUIREMENTS			$ 1,093,198.0

ADDITIONAL REVENUE REQUIRED

Federal Sources:			
PL 96-123	$ 100,000.00		
PL 96-123 (50% for 1985-1986)	50,000.00		
Total Federal		$150,000.00	
State Sources:			
State Aid 1984-1985	$ 130,000.00		
State Aid (50% for 1985-1986)	65,000.00		
Total State		$195,000.00	
Local Sources:			
Transfer from General Fund	$ 267,300.00		
Transfer from General Fund (7/1/85 -12/31/85)	133,650.00		
Interest Income	347,248.07		
Total Local		$748,198.07	
TOTAL ADDITIONAL REVENUE REQUIRED			$ 1,093,198.0

(Source: Wichita Public Schools)

experience. Prior to 1970 most students of Mexican background in Wichita generally spoke English. Wichita's improving economy is credited with having attracted many Mexican nationals whose children also came without English proficiency or who were born here into Spanish-speaking families that did little to encourage the use of English. Thus the need for bilingual education for Hispanic children seems to be increasing in the 1980s.

Our research associate Kim Allen interviewed a number of school administrators in Wichita regarding the needs of Spanish-speaking children of illegal alien parents. She noted the fact that lack of English was only one of many stumbling blocks, since it was difficult to coax the child of an undocumented parent into the classroom. One spokesperson at a local school said illegal alien parents were reluctant to send their children to school and gave the following list of reasons:

1. Cultural differences between Anglo and Mexican communities.
2. Fear of identification as undocumented and the risk of deportation.
3. Embarrassment at enrollment time for lack of appropriate documentation.
4. Poor schooling in Mexico and subsequent fear of entering a U.S. system.
5. Seasonal work by parents interferes with children's schooling.
6. Belief among many undocumented that only U.S. citizens can attend school.
7. Fees and tuition where applicable.[80]

The report by Kim Allen continues: "During the 1973-74 school year, Horace Mann school instituted a federally funded bilingual program focusing on both English and Spanish instruction. However, it was not successful, and the eight to ten students who needed English skills to survive did not sufficiently benefit. It was the establishment of programs by the Wichita Public Schools that marked a significant beginning of an attempt to deal with the problem of non-English speaking students in Wichita. In 1975-76, the schools initiated an English as a Second Language Program (ESL) on the east side of town, a situation which primarily served Asian students. A year later, the schools established a bilingual program, which served 57 Hispanic students in 1976-77.

The two programs, as noted at the onset, differ significantly in approach." [81]

"Obviously, money is a key factor in determining what sort of education the children of the new Mexican immigrants receive. The bilingual program was tied to a Title VII federal grant which expires this year (1984). The bulk of the Bilingual/ESL budget, however, comes from state and local funds. Beginning in the school year 1979-80, the Wichita school district began to receive monetary support from the Kansas Bilingual Act, support which is expected to equal nearly $200,000 this year. According to Graciela Kavulla, it costs approximately $2,600 a year to educate the regular student in the Wichita Public Schools. The 1984 Bilingual/ESL budget, however, is $871,400, and divided among the 918 "limited English proficiency" pupils this year, an estimated $950 per year is required above the $2,600 to educate the student who needs to learn English. Despite the fact that many believe that the Bilingual/ESL programs are too limited, the programs already in operation are admittedly expensive."[82]

From the foregoing it would appear that the presence of Spanish-speaking children of illegal alien parents costs the Wichita schools considerably both in dollar/budgetary terms and in the form of administrative/teaching demands. Many students who come into Wichita from rural backgrounds are near illiterate, if not completely so, and require much special attention. The fact that most cannot write or read in Spanish makes education in any language extremely difficult. We know that some children in Wichita share their parents' fear that they may be apprehended and deported by the INS.[83] This is an especially bitter situation when the children involved are U.S. citizens, but who may be foreced abruptly to leave school because of complications from their parents' illegal alienage. This circumstance was involved as reported earlier in connection with the September, 1984, INS raid in Wichita.

Children who are abruptly taken out of school and sent elsewhere as their parents' work schedule demands, or who are forced to return to Mexico for family reasons or because of action by the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, probably gain little from the investment made in them by Wichita's school system. In this way the migrant students join America's widening pool of undereducated and disadvantaged persons which society finds it increasingly difficult to absorb.

What is critical along with the above issues of human deprivation is that the richness of the Hispanic culture be saved, honored, but not emasculated or permanently sullied through capricious and haphazard mixing with the Anglo culture. There is no reason to fear or deprecate an aesthetically pleasing amalgamation of English and Spanish in colloquial speech or literature. But to allow individuals to be functionally illiterate in both languages and to foster slang hybrids that stigmatize the user socially and impede his or her economic mobility is a serious cultural loss.

The question of proper response to bilingual education has impacted also on educators and school administrators. Educational bureaucracies may lose effectiveness in meeting the needs of foreign born students when unproductive professional rivalries erupt on the basis of competing ideologies as to pedagogical techniques and approaches. Yet there is a quest among some educational officials to steer this competition into constructive channels. We spoke with Kathleen Mellor, Coordinator for Bilingual Education and English as a Second Language for the Wichita Public Schools. She is also president of KATESOL (Kansas Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages). Speaking for herself only, Mellor explained her belief that an unfortuante set of hostile sterotypes has developed nationwide in which ESL teachers are pitted against bilingual education teachers. The tendency, according to Mellor, is for the ESL "camp" to accuse the bilingualists of simply teaching Spanish and not much

else. The bilingualist "camp," on the other hand, sometimes accuses ESL specialists of teaching English only and of sacrificing appreciation for Hispanic culture. Mellor's position is that these two "camps" are really natural partners who should be working together for the singular purpose of helping to integrate limited English proficient students into U.S. society.[84]

Undeniably it is a major task of public education to preserve the diverse ethnic richness found in American society while still providing a common linguistic basis for the overall functioning of the state. As Alfonso Nava, a resident Wichita scholar, recently put it:

> Given the complex nature of these diverse ethnic groups and the significant impact they have had on American society, public schools, social services, etc., it would behoove policy decision-makers at all levels of . . . government to support programs that foster a positive image of the diverse language and cultural assets that Hispanics bring to the American way of life.[85]

At least potentially a drastic reform of laws governing immigrants and aliens in this country, plus continued public support for bilingual education would do much to help integrate these displaced people into American society. And there are certainly ways in which U.S. foreign policy could be molded to discourage their surreptitious coming in the first place. This is a theme to which I will return in the concluding chapter of this report, i. e. changing the rules governing alien migration in the Americas to present viably humane alternatives to illegality both here in Wichita as well as elsewhere in the United States. But the challenge of educating those who have earned, in one way or another, an equity in staying in the United States remains. In Wichita both public and private schools continue to grope for solutions to this dilemma.[86]

Concluding Observations on Chapter Three

Wichita has had a difficult recent history of race relations between Hispanics and law enforcement agencies. While relationships with local police appear to have vastly improved over the past five years, they may have worsened with the Immigration and Naturalization Service during the same period. Continuing displacement of Mexicans (largely for economic reasons) and Central Americans (largely for political reasons) into the United States and here in Kansas places further strains on Hispanic relationships with government. Local Hispanics in Wichita are caught in a dilemma. They feel a moral obligation to aid needy Spanish-speaking immigrants with whose plight they must sympathize for ethnic-laden, humanitarian reasons. But this collides with established immigration law which prohibits the aiding, abetting, and harboring of illegal aliens. The circumstance is made further difficult for the native U.S. citizen Hispanics because socially they are embarrassed at being associated with the illegals, who often represent a lower cultural stratum. That is central to the Hispanic paradox as it emerges from this preliminary investigation in Wichita. Where law enforcement policy is concerned, then, the greatest amount of contact, pressure, and interaction seems to be triangular among the law enforcement authorities, the established Hispanics, and the Spanish-speaking newcomers. Two thirds of that "triangle" is Hispanic.

In the matter of public health services for the needy immigrant Hispanics, however, the dimensions of contact reach out in a more complicated fashion to include a greater number of non-Hispanic participants. The Hispanic Clinic, discussed in the foregoing pages, could probably not operate were it not for the contributions of many non-Hispanic persons and organizations. Indeed, at the moment of this writing, it would appear that most of the Clinic's volunteers are not of Hispanic

origin. Most are persons with either an interest in Hispanic culture or those with foreign experience in Latin America, or both. Almost none of the doctors working in the contemporary Hispanic Clinic in Wichita are of Hispanic origin. The public health impact of the Spanish-speaking migration, and the service response in Wichita, involves far more than the Hispanic community or its organizations. If there is a "triangle" to be formed here it involves the Clinic's staff and volunteers on one side, the religious organizations (led by the United Methodists) on the other, and the Wesley Medical Center and other contributing medical sources as a third. We could say, therefore, that in health services the Wichita reaction to the presence of Spanish-speaking needy is a broader community enterprise than is the case with law enforcement.

Finally, in the matter of bilingual education, the triangular analogy seems to have less relevance. Involved are federal education authorities and their policies pursuant to legislative and judicial mandates. Active also are local school authorities whose convictions about bilingual education generally (including ESL) are often at odds with those of teachers and some school administrators. Finally there is the Spanish-speaking public which occasions the need for such programs. The interaction between the above groups may be complicated intermittently by activities of the Immigration and Naturalization Service as we have seen. Competition with other ethnic groups for educational resources is a separate influence set which has an impact. Attitudes of the Anglo-dominated American public toward providing special education for the foreign born are also operative. The interplay of these forces determines whether there will be an educational response to the Spanish-speaking immigration in Wichita.

Thus, the continued input of Spanish-speaking immigrants causes major

adaptive response patterns which can be delineated and, to some degree, assigned a dollar value in the areas of public health and education. Law enforcement appears more difficult to quantify. What we cannot quantify is the richness of life to which these immigrants contribute nor the degree to which they may consume a range of other community services whose supply is probably not infinite. To make the present study more complete we need to do further intensive studies into the impact of Hispanic migrants in at least two major areas. These are employment and housing. But other areas suggest themselves quite obviously, among them public transportation, small business development and economic diversity, the cultural "halo" effect of having foreign subcultures in our midst (presumed here to be a positive attribute), and ethnic relations generally. A major goal of this preliminary report is to lay a basis for doing such studies in the near future.

Footnotes Chapter Three

1. The Wichita Eagle, June 26, 1979.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. The Wichita Eagle-Beacon, June 24, 1979.
5. Kansas Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights, report on Police-Community Relations in the City of Wichita and Sedgwick County, published in Kansas City, Missouri by the Central States Regional Office of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, July 1980. The Kansas Advisory Committee is referred to in the text as "Kansas Civil Rights Commission", p. 15.
6. The Wichita Eagle, February 26, 1974.
7. Kansas Advisory Committee op. cit., p. 19.
8. Ibid., p. 21.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. Memorandum on file, no date, contained in LULAC press release June 23, 1978.
12. Interviews with Victor Montemayor, Jr. by Ken Johnson during spring and summer, 1984.
13. Ibid. Again, reference is to Kansas Advisory Committee as in #5 above.
14. Ibid.
15. Kansas Advisory Committee op. cit., p. 21.
16. Ibid., p. 22.
17. Ibid.
18. Research cited by John J. Hartman and Bernice Hutcherson in Kansas Advisory Committee, op. cit., p. 25.
19. The Wichita Eagle, June 27, 1979.
20. The Wichita Eagle, June 26, 1979.
21. Kansas Advisory Committee op. cit., pp. 33-34.
22. El Perico, March, 1979 (Wichita)
23. Ibid.
24. Ibid. Speech reproduced in Spanish and English.
25. Montemayor to LaMunyon, March 28, 1979.
26. LaMunyon to Montemayor, February 22, 1979.

27. Memorandum from Victor Montemayor's scrapbook, no date.

28. The Wichita Eagle-Beacon, October 1, 1980.

29. Ibid.

30. Ibid.

31. The Wichita Eagle-Beacon, September 30, 1980.

32. Ibid.

33. Interview by Phil Alldritt with Major Kerry D. Crisp, Wichita Police Department, September 14, 1984.

34. Ibid.

35. Ibid.

36. From 18 U.S.C. 241, 242, as quoted by the Kansas Advisory Committee op. cit., p. 43.

37. The Wichita Eagle-Beacon, September 30, 1980.

38. Interviews by Ken Johnson with Richard Noriega, Summer, 1984.

39. The Wichita Eagle-Beacon, September 30, 1980.

40. Ibid.

41. The Wichita Eagle-Beacon, September 28, 1980.

42. Ibid.

43. The Wichita Eagle-Beacon, September 30, 1980.

44. The Wichita Eagle, August 22, 1973.

45. The Wichita Eagle, March 15, 1970.

46. Ibid.

47. The Wichita Eagle, August 28, 1970.

48. The Wichita Eagle, January 23, 1977.

49. Ibid.

50. The Wichita Eagle, April 13, 1978.

51. The Wichita Eagle, January 11, 1979.

52. The Wichita Eagle, January 23, 1977.

53. Ibid.

54. The Wichita Eagle-Beacon, June 18, 1980.

55. The Wichita Eagle-Beacon, July 19, 1981.

56. Ibid.

57. The Wichita Eagle-Beacon, January 22, 1983.

58. The Wichita Eagle-Beacon, June 17, 1984.

59. Ibid.

60. Interview by Phil Alldritt with Ron Sanders, District Director of INS, Kansas City, Missouri, October 2, 1984.

61. Interview by Ken Johnson, Sherri Bayouth, et. al. with John Alquest, SRS director in Wichita and members of his staff, September 20, 1984.

62. Sherri Bayouth "field notes," October 4, 1984.

63. Sherri Bayouth and Ken Johnson "field notes," October 15, 1984.

64. Interviews by Sherri Bayouth with Martha Sanchez, Director, United Methodist Hispanic Ministries, October 1984.

65. Ibid.

66. Phil Alldritt, op. cit.

67. Ibid.

68. Interviews by Ken Johnson during November 1984, with Tomasa Gonzalez and Rachel Rubalcava.

69. Interview by Ken Johnson with Rev. Chuck Chipman, January 7, 1985.

70. Interviews by Ken Johnson during November and December 1984, with Martha Sanchez and Rev. Martin Holler.

71. The current practice of limiting treatment to the financially needy is seen by founding clinic personnel as a departure in philosophy. The original intent was to serve everyone needing bilingual medical attention in a reasonably authentic cultural surrounding and without all the strict rules of personal behavior typically associated with an "Anglo" medical office. Interview by Ken Johnson with Tana Fender, January 5, 1985.

72. The rules provide that any patient who misses two appointments will lose his/her clinic status and will have to reapply. Each patient is responsible for keeping the clinic informed as to his changing address and other personal information. Patients who cannot keep their children under control in the clinic will lose privileges.

Patients must cooperate in keeping the clinic area clean and orderly. Recent practical experience has dictated these rules as some volunteers would not work without them.

73. The Piburn Clinic is so known for the Methodist missionary doctor who directs it.

74. Clipping from The Wichita Eagle-Beacon, no date but believed of 1981 origin.

75. Interview by Ken Johnson with Rev. Chuck Chipman, January 7, 1985.

76. Interviews by Ken Johnson with Kathleen Mellor during January 1985.

77. Interviews by Sherri Bayouth with Kathleen Mellor, Graciela Kavulla, and other school officials during October and November of 1984. Follow-up interviews were also conducted by Phil Alldritt in November, 1984.

78. Interview by Ken Johnson with Kathleen Mellor, Op. Cit.

79. Kim A. Allen, Wichita Public Schools and the New Immigrant from Mexico unpublished research report, June 1, 1984, p. 1.

80. Ibid., p. 2

81. Ibid., p. 2-3

82. Ibid., p. 5.

83. Interviews by Ken Johnson, October, 1984 in Wichita, Kansas.

84. Interviews by Ken Johnson with Kathleen Mellor, January 4, 1985.

85. Alfonso Nava, "Hispanic Diversity in the United States," in EL Perico (Wichita) January 1985, p. 1.

86. In 1981 the U.S. Department of Education announced that it would not enforce policies requiring children to be taught in a language other than English on the grounds that to do so would be an intrusion on state and local responsibility, that it would be unfair and unworkable vis a vis the majority of students. This meant withdrawal of the then proposed Title VI Bilingual Education (Lau) Rules. It would allow secondary and elementary schools to continue to operate bilingual education programs meeting local needs and within the context of broad national guidelines. From Department of Education press release, "Statement by Terrel H. Bell, Secretary of Education" issued on February 2, 1981.

Note on the "Lau Remedies"

On January 14, 1974 the U.S. Supreme Court reached a critical decision in the case of Lau vs Nichols involving the need of Chinese students in San Francisco for special training in English. The Court set forth the principle that failure to provide non-English-speaking children with instruction they could understand violated their right to an equal education. The LAU Remedies developed by various federal offices (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office for Civil Rights, etc.) pursuant to that court decision stipulated that instruction in ESL (English as a Second Language) by itself was not sufficient to aid minority children and that bilingual education would be needed to comply with the LAU decision. "Initially, school districts wishing to develop bilingual education programs could do so at their own discretion. But by 1976 school districts having 20 or more national origin minority children of the same language group other than English had to develop bilingual education programs or be out of compliance with Lau and possibly lose their federal funds." This trend, it would appear, is now being reversed in the 1980s. See Guadalupe San Miguel, Jr., "Conflict and Controversy in the Evolution of Bilingual Education in the United States," in Social Science Quarterly, June, 1984, Vol. 65, No. 2, pp. 505-518.

CHAPTER FOUR

PROMINENT WICHITA HISPANICS: A SOCIAL AND ATTITUDINAL PROFILE*

Introduction: The foregoing chapter sought to detail salient dimensions of the adaptive patterns and responses that Wichita's Hispanics and some public agencies made to the continued arrival in the community of Spanish-speaking immigrants. That discussion focused on three general areas of social concern; law enforcement, health care, and education. It suggested further policy areas meriting inquiry as our future funding for such research permits. The present chapter seeks to focus on Hispanic leadership elements, to delimit an attitudinal profile of the Hispanic leadership in Wichita with respect to a number of social and attitudinal components.

For purposes of this chapter we understand "leadership" in a somewhat loose way to include well-known Hispanic persons who may be both social activists and respected, prominent citizens. Our technique for developing a panel of respondents was simply the reputational method of asking an initial respondent group to recommend other prominent persons to us. We allowed the process to mushroom until it appeared that we had gotten just about everyone who was reputationally "prominent" among Hispanic Wichitans. We also advertised in the local bilingual newspaper El Perico asking persons who had been overlooked to come forth if they

---

*Parts of this chapter originally appeared as "Characteristics and Attitudes of the Emerging Hispanic Leadership Community" co-authored by J.J. Hartman, K.F. Johnson, and J.W. McKenney and presented at the annual convention of the Kansas Sociological Society in October, 1984 at Lawrence, Kansas.

wished to participate in the survey.

Out of a total of forty-two persons contacted and asked to participate by filling out our questionnaire a total of 31 representing 74 percent of the 42 provided the information that is included in the profile to follow. About eight others (outside the 42) made it known they would not participate before we got to the formal invitational stage. A copy of this questionnaire is included in Appendix A. It was intended as a basic probe, a preliminary descriptive instrument only. There is no way to know precisely what percentage of the total population of "prominent Wichita Hispanics" we actually contacted; but our consultations with a special advisory panel of Hispanics encourages the belief that we did contact at least 80 percent of that probable universe (this included, of course, only U.S. citizen Hispanics and legal resident aliens, the task of surveying illegal aliens being left for a future appendage to this overall study). Speaking of a "universe" does not, however, imply that we intend to use a microcosm of people drawn from Wichita's Hispanic community as a basis for generalizing about the total universe of American Hispanics.

For the moment we might best understand our sample as yielding a public profile with "public" understood somewhat as in the discussion of the term contained in Hartman and Hedblom, i.e. "publics are social aggregates interacting in terms of unspecific roles and without a common leader." [1] We will, of course, be able to identify certain persons as key leaders within the overall Hispanic "public" of Wichita but their roles are usually de facto and fluid without being formally codified by social convention or

through political enactment. We assume that use of a standard questionnaire for all respondent members of the "public" or group we have denominated "prominent Wichita Hispanics" enables each participant to tell his story, or part of it, through the medium of our instrument, and that by aggregating these responses we create data which speak about an independent social reality, i.e. the profile we seek to extract and present here. [2]

Table D at the end of the chapter contains the full tabulation of responses which are offered here as a profile of Hispanic Wichitans. Some of those data are excerpted and repeated in the discussion to follow.

Sex of respondents. Almost half of the individuals responding were female (14 of 31), which is not unusual in such material typically presented for other minority group relationships. It is often the case that females obtain more education than their group as an average and qualify for positions that make them more visible in both the minority community and the larger community. In some cases, their positions actually allow and encourage advocacy participation as part of their responsibility. This would more likely be the case in social service agencies, church-related groups, or larger bureaucracies which feel a need for involvement in social activities throughout the local community. It appears this principle is operating to a degree among the female Hispanics we surveyed in Wichita.

Age of respondents. In novel social situations where history, norms, customs, and traditions are lacking, one might not expect to find the "older heads" in the forefront. Such is the case in Wichita, with two-thirds of the respondents forty years or under

and a third of them thirty years or under. Less than 20 percent are over fifty years and only about 30 percent are over forty years of age. These data may be more indicative of a developing movement or of an emerging awareness than of the overall Hispanic community at large. Most of those considered to be leaders or notables would still qualify for the Junior Chamber of Commerce or the Junior League on an age basis alone.

Marital Status. The respondents for the most part are married, and due to the relatively young age of the group most also have children. Seventy-seven percent of the group were married, and 55 percent reported they still have children residing at home. This finding suggests a busy, involved lifestyle on the part of the respondents. Certainly, the presence of children at home is taxing and time-consuming for both the male and female respondents, thereby placing constraints on their freedom to engage in civic leadership roles.

Employment Status. Almost 90 percent of those reporting employment status were presently employed, indicating that those perceived as leaders did not come exclusively from housewives and retired persons having a surplus of time. Rather, recognized leaders came from those essentially employed full-time. Over half (54%) of those reporting their occupation were either professionals or managers, officials or proprietors, further indicating the ability of leaders to free up time for civic activities if they so desired. It is somewhat more difficult for lower-paid employees to be absent from work, and further, it is a personal cost to them through lost time and pay. Admittedly, leisure time

was not uniformly distributed among the diverse lifestyles of the respondents.

Nativity and Ancestry. While we approached the community broadly as an Hispanic one, we expected the majority to be of Mexican background and heritage. Such proved to be the case, with 65 percent claiming Mexican ancestors. Almost half (48%) of the respondents' parents were born in Mexico, and 61 percent had grandparents born in Mexico. Other than Equador, mentioned by three persons, no other Hispanic country had more than one person mentioned in the leadership pool. However, almost 20 percent had at least one of their parents born in the U.S. Hence, the Hispanic community's prominent members have strongest ties with Mexico.

Community. One of the major considerations of the study was to determine whether a sense of community actually existed in the minds of the respondents. Data presented below indicate that all but one person responded that there was a sense of an Hispanic community in Wichita and, further, that most (87%) actually identify with that community (excerpted from total presentation of data appearing in Table D).

Existence of Hispanic Community in Wichita

	N	Percent
yes	30	96.7
no	0	0.0
don't know	1	3.2
		99.9%

Hispanic Identity of Respondent

yes	27	87.0
no	2	6.4
don't know	2	6.4
		99.9%

The extent of transfer of identity with the community was tested by the next two questions. First, did the respondent actually participate? And, secondly, what was the extent of that participation? Data presented below indicate almost universal participation on a relatively regular basis (these data are also extracted from Table D which appears at the end of this chapter).

Does Respondent Participate in Hispanic Affairs

	N	Percent
yes	28	90.3
no	2	6.4
no response	1	3.2
		99.9%

Frequency of Such Participation

Regularly	12	38.7
occasionally	12	38.7
seldom	4	12.9
never	0	0.0
other	0	0.0
no response	3	9.7
		100.0%

Participation in Specific Hispanic Organizations. This question drew a mix of inconclusive results as can be seen from Annex #15 in Table D at the end of this chapter. From this evidence one must conclude that either no single organization commands dominance over Hispanic participation or else our respondents misunderstood or evaded the question for unknown reasons.

Confidence in Democratic Participation Process. Some 38.7 percent of the respondents described themselves as very confident in their efficacy via participation in the democratic process and 41.9 percent expressed moderate confidence. This left less than 5 percent of the sample population in the discouraged (perhaps politically alienated) category. Such a result may not be surprising given the fact that we were sampling prominent Wichita Hispanics who could be expected to be active political participants.

Confidence in Democratic Participation Process.

very confident	12	38.7
moderately confident	13	41.9
discouraged	1	3.2
other	5	16.1
		99.9%

Nevertheless, during open-ended interviews we got the distinct impression that many Wichitans of prominent Hispanic rank were not confident in the democratic process in-so-far as dealing with current public policy issues are concerned. Such a negative result is further consonant with an earlier survey of Hispanic Wichitans which found "that long-standing members of the Hispanic community become disillusioned with their potential for a significant input into the democratic process. [3] Our recent survey result shown above may, then, be spurious, but it could also reflect some recent

optimism that has permeated the Hispanic "public" as we sampled it. It may be that a broader survey not focused solely on prominent persons would yield a different result. This is an area meriting further investigation via intensive interviewing within a format permitting greater depth.

Public Policy Issues and the Most Effective Pro-Hispanic Organization in Wichita. Annex 17 of Table D shows churches generally, Methodist churches in particular, the Hispanic Women's Network, the SER organization, and LULAC as the most highly rated promoters of Hispanic causes in Wichita. The list of public policy issues specified reveals unemployment, racial discrimination, the Wolf Creek nuclear plant controversy, and Hispanic representation on the Wichita City Commission as prime concerns. Listed as key internal issues facing Hispanics in Wichita were job discrimination, employment access, and education. These issues could be targeted for attitudinal analysis in greater depth as this research effort is expanded in future years.

Further interpretation of the data indicate generally favorable attitudes toward traditional concerns about any immigrant group. Common belief has it that incoming groups deprive locals of jobs and tend to depress wages in their eagerness to find and maintain jobs and income. If that is the case in the Hispanic community, it was not evidenced by the leadership respondents. While one-fourth felt aliens might depress wages, none of the respondents felt aliens deprive others of jobs. This is an interesting finding in light of the often-depressed circumstances in which illegals are forced to work. Often, work must be

clandestine or for day wages rather than on a regular payroll basis. (Data excerpted from Table D as follows):

Illegal Aliens Depress Wages	N	Percent
yes	8	25.8
no	21	67.7
don't know	2	6.4
		99.9%

They Deprive Others of Jobs		
yes	0	0.0
no	27	87.1
don't know	4	12.9
		100.0%

Evidence of favorable attitudes toward illegals is shown in the following results. Sixty-four percent favor granting amnesty to illegal aliens. Almost none favor national identification or work cards showing the status of the bearer. It was felt that this would foster harassment and questioning of Hispanics due to their physical appearance. Further evidence of supportive attitudes toward Mexican aliens is indicated by the 61 percent who favor a guest worker program and by the fact that there was no decisive support for stricter border enforcement to minimize the influx of Mexican nationals and others who enter the borders without documents and inspection.

Grant Amnesty to Illegals

	N	Percent
favor	20	64.5
oppose	3	9.7
uncertain	8	25.8
other	0	0.0
		100.0%

National ID or Work Cards

favor	2	6.4
oppose	18	58.1
uncertain	9	29.0
don't know	2	6.4
		99.9%

A New Guest Worker Program

favor	19	61.3
oppose	2	6.4
uncertain	7	22.6
other	3	9.7
		100.0%

Stricter Border Enforcement

favor	9	29.0
oppose	8	25.8
uncertain	12	38.7
NR	2	6.4
		99.9%

Social Services Referral. The question of where to refer new Spanish-speaking arrivals in Wichita produces top recognition for these institutions: United Methodist Urban Ministries, the SER organization, Our Lady of Perpetual Help Church, and Catholic Social Services. This can be seen in Annex 30 of Table D.

Cultural Contribution of and Association with New Arrivals. These two issues emerged from this preliminary study as being of critical importance to established Hispanic Wichitans. Some 61 percent of our respondents felt that the new arrivals make a cultural contribution to Wichita. However, nearly 20 percent voted "no" on this issue and another near 20 percent professed "don't know."

Cultural Contribution by Spanish-Speaking Immigrants

yes	19	61.3
no	6	19.4
don't know	6	19.4
		100.1%

Reluctant Association with New Immigrants

named	15	48.4
none	16	51.6
		100.0%

This encourages our belief that association with new Spanish-speaking arrivals is a major psychosociological problem for many Wichita Hispanics. During personal interviews with K.F. Johnson that were spread out over more than a calendar year, it was obvious that many long-term established Hispanics in Wichita do not want the so-called Anglo community to associate them with the newcomers, especially those who are illegal Mexican aliens. Many of the prominent Hispanics interviewed stated privately that they preferred to keep a marked social distance from the Spanish-speaking

newcomers, and this attitude was also held by many of those established Hispanics employed in both public and private social services destined for the newcomers. As principal researcher on the project Professor Johnson himself received occasional mild expressions of disapproval from establishment Hispanics because of Johnson's personally having fraternized socially with several illegal Mexican aliens.

On the questionnaire about half of the respondents admitted they knew of instances when locally established Hispanics were reluctant to associate with Spanish-speaking newcomers. A general belief was expressed informally that Mexican newcomers speak bad English and Spanish, have poor social manners, and generally represent a lower cultural stratum. At the social level, then, it appears that the most negative impact of the continued clandestine immigration from Mexico is on the native Wichita Hispanics themselves. Again, socially, the coming of these new people appears to present a much more serious emotional problem for established Hispanics than for the Anglos.

It appears, however, that this contention does not apply to the black community. The question of reluctant association needs considerable investigation before being formulated as a general principle. But how to relate personally and socially to the illegal aliens is surely one of the most divisive issues affecting Hispanic community life in Wichita.

Desired Cultural Changes in Wichita. Annex 34 shows the range of responses to this open question. Communication, education, and expressions of what might be termed "togetherness" seemed

most prominent. As far as respondent confidence in such change occurring was concerned, the pattern was substantially divided as can be seen in entry 35 of Table D.

Fair Treatment for Local Hispanics. The range of substantive responses to the open part of this question appears in Annex 36 and ethnic cleavage potential is notable therein. Probably a larger sample would yield a better basis for gauging local Hispanic resentment over the question of fairness. As it emerged from this preliminary survey, some 35 percent cited instances of unfairness.

Natural Segregation Among Latinos. This question yielded about a 52 percent consensus that the various Hispanic subgroups tended to segregate socially, i.e. Cubans, Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, etc. Because our sample was small and probably overrepresented some of the non-Mexican groups this finding is hardly conclusive.

Should Illegal Aliens be Deported? As can be seen from Table D some 61 percent of our respondents voted no, hardly 13 percent voted yes, leaving about 25 percent undecided. Taken as a broad ethnic aggregate it is difficult for most Hispanics to openly favor deportation of other Hispanics. A valuable follow-up, however, would be an intensive examination of those "deviant" Hispanics who are prepared to identify themselves formally with deportation of illegal aliens.

Illegal Mexican Aliens: Special Treatment? Again the smallness of our sample is an obstacle to inference here. The fact that our result shows nearly half of the respondents voting either

in favor of special treatment for the Mexican illegals or refusing to say "no" becomes strongly suggestive of the sensitivity this issue holds for the Mexican-dominated Hispanic community. We plan a more extensive public survey in Wichita to test the depth of such sensitivity.

The Question of Central American Refugees. The strong favorable response (nearly 62%) toward legal alien status for Central American refugees seems convincing among our Hispanic respondents. Similarly they supported (nearly 68%) church decisions to grant sanctuary to those refugees.

Legal Alien Status for Central American Refugees

favor	19	61.3
oppose	2	6.4
undecided	7	22.6
don't know	3	9.7
		100.0%

Church Sanctuaries Morally Justified?

yes	21	67.7
no	3	9.7
other	7	22.6
		100.0%

At the time of the research there was only one publicly declared religious sanctuary in Kansas (see Chapter Five). The U.S. government was then insisting that the refugees should be treated no differently from any other set of illegal aliens. When asked about Central American refugees being welcome in Wichita, 51.6 percent responded positively, 6.4 negatively, and the remainder gave a variety of mixed or non-committal responses. The Central American refugees seem not to be a major factor of cleavage or controversy as are the Mexican migrants. The former are viewed sympathetically as victims of political violence and terrorism, the latter as sojourners seeking economic relief.

Respondents were asked to rate how well Central American refugees fit into the community. Those who felt they knew for the most part believed they were welcomed, but 42 percent didn't comment. The difference between political refugee status and illegal alienage was noted in the contrast with the question about how well illegal aliens fit in with local Hispanics. [4] Almost a third perceived there was no problem, but another third felt illegal aliens were ill-adjusted. The finding that illegal aliens are perceived in Wichita as ill-adjusted would appear cautiously supportive of survey results done in other U.S. cities. (In one study, for instance, some 50 out of 225 respondent Hispanics exhibited hostile attitudes toward undocumented Mexican workers.) [5]

Aid to Mexico Effective? Very few of our respondents felt the giving of aid to Mexico would help solve social problems there or that the Mexican government would use such aid wisely. In fact some 88 percent were either uncertain, doubted the proposition, or didn't know.

Aid to Mexico Effective?

very confident	1	3.2
confident	3	9.7
uncertain	10	32.2
doubtful	4	12.9
strongly doubtful	7	22.6
don't know	6	19.4
		100.0%

Our respondents were mostly educated people well aware of endemic governmental corruption in Mexico. The wider popular survey we have in the planning stage may yield a less perjorative view. But our prominent Hispanic respondents were not taking the

simplistic view that more aid to Mexico would mean fewer illegal aliens crossing into the U.S.

Hispanic Events-Services-Conclusions. The final entries in Table D show strong support for Pan-Hispanic events in Wichita, moderate evidence of discrimination against Hispanics, and an ample survey of needed community services (see entries 44-48 and corresponding annexes). One detects the need for more ample social services and yet our respondent groups contained few if any who would ever use them personally. Our planned survey of popular opinion among Hispanic Wichitans may shed new light on the question.

Summary and Discussion. This exploratory, descriptive inquiry was designed to assess the presence of an Hispanic community in Wichita, Kansas, to develop a tentative social and attitudinal profile of the purported community, and to examine certain reputational characteristics of this prominent-figure-and-leadership group. To that end, informal contacts, personal visits, work in the Hispanic community activities led to development of a list of reputational leaders. A total of 42 persons were named to the list, and 31 of these eventually provided data by responding to a descriptive questionnaire. Upon examination of the basic tabular results and in the light of extensive in-depth interviews, it was decided that an Hispanic community does exist in the true sociological sense in Wichita. That is--community is perceived as a sense of qualified belonging, awareness, a degree of pride and recognition.

We are convinced that community identification is strongest when defined in terms of Hispanic subgroups (e.g. Mexicans, Cubans, etc.) rather than toward Hispanics taken as a broad social aggregate. Community was not perceived as a narrowly defined geographical "barrio" concept, because none exists within the city. To be sure, however, there is noted concentration of Hispanics in the city's north-central area due to personal choice plus economic and income limitations. Yet, the area is shared with other minority groups such as Southeast Asians, blacks, and American Indians as well as whites in the same economic strata. There is no large concentration of Hispanic businesses relying essentially on Hispanics for patronage in the city. Responses suggesting that a community does exist, and use of that concept by respondents, leads to the conclusion that community is a viable perceptual entity or "public" in Wichita.

Another objective was to see who constitutes the reputational

leadership among the Hispanics and what are its social and demographic characteristics. It was noted that the named leadership was younger, more female, and more professional in occupation, and strongly family-oriented. Both young age and the high proportion of females mentioned would differ from expectations in the larger community. Professional occupation status in the Hispanic community would be consistent with similar findings in the general leadership community, but we found more individuals in "service" occupations than would be expected in most community studies. The sociodemographic characteristics of the reputational leaders are not necessarily consistent with traditional leadership communities studied elsewhere. An emerging community or newly formed community would more likely depict the characteristics of the reputational leaders surveyed herein.

A major focal point was that of general attitude and assessment of the community toward illegal aliens and refugees and attitudes toward some specific actions and programs relating to the clandestine migration phenomenon. In general, the respondents were well aware of the presence of illegal aliens in the community. Their evaluation of questions about aliens having depressed wages, taking jobs, and becoming integrated into the community was quite favorable. There was no strong consensus on any program restricting or deporting aliens, but general consensus did exist on giving refugees sanctuary and in favor of guest worker programs.

The question of how established Hispanics should relate to illegal aliens proved troublesome to our respondents both on the questionnaire and during the informal interviews. To a major extent the previously cited press comment from the early 1980s prevailed as late as 1985, i.e. that "illegal aliens give Wichita's Hispanics a bad name."[6] Another source of conflict for the Hispanic community is the rival oriental and

and black communities. Specific challenges are the ethnic cleavage with Vietnamese refugees (whom Hispanics often resent for the favored treatment our government accords them) and friction with the black community, many of whom resent Hispanics as perceived hosts of the illegal aliens from Latin America who allegedly rob blacks of their jobs. Wichita can expect ethnic conflict to occur along these lines.

Perhaps most critical to Hispanic unity and identity is the dilemma of perceived "Hispanicness" or hispanidad! Who are the most Hispanic among the Hispanics and what criteria shall be used in such a judgment? In the course of our in-depth interviews a number of prominent Hispanics in Wichita took special pains to stress their own hispanidad. Most often this took the form of proud references to their immigrant parents or to participation in cultural events like the Cinco de Mayo celebration or the typically Mexican religious holidays in December. Others stressed their maintenance of Spanish as at least a secondary language. A few prominent Hispanics even criticized others as not being legitimately Hispanic because of having abandoned Spanish or of not ever having learned it. Occasionally such a charge would emerge publicly.[7]

As perceived by those Hispanics strongly identified with hispanidad some of their ethnic brethern have tried so hard to blend into the broader community that they cease to be Hispanic. During the interviews K.F. Johnson was surprised to hear a few Hispanics stress almost with pride that they did not speak Spanish. One prominent individual with strongly Mexican features went so far as to insist that he was not Hispanic in what he called a "culturally participatory sense," although he admitted that his ability to speak Spanish was a major asset in his work. A former mayor of Wichita, a Cuban by birth, even told the press he did not want to be considered an Hispanic, only an American just like everyone

else.[8]

Thus it appears that the question of whether the Hispanic culture (in its various ethnic subgroup components) either can or should be maintained presents a major dilemma for Hispanic Wichitans. As such it could be one of the key unknowns affecting the outcome of any concerted effort to mobilize local Hispanics into a cohesive and effective political force. In order to constitute such a force, one assumes that Hispanics must first agree on <u>if</u> and <u>how</u> to be what they themselves truly want to be; or whether to simply resign themselves to the inevitability of losing separate eithnic identity by letting themselves fade quietly into ethnic obscurity, i.e. becoming an indistinguishable part of the Great American Society.* Our Wichita evidence strongly suggests that U.S. citizen Hispanics tend to be weakening as a cohesive social and political force and that ambiguities over ethnic identity underlie much of that process. Further, our evidence indicates that the continued input of Spanish-speaking newcomers may be hastening that crumbling process rather than arresting it.[9]

---

*<u>A Conceptual Note on Ethnicity</u>. There is a separate literature concerning the nature and existence of a generalized Latino identity that can be considered separate from the specific ethnic identifications of Mexicans, Cubans, etc., i. e. an "umbrella" identity which may at times encompass them all. In this vein we might talk of Latino and Hispanic identities as interchangeable. Felix Padilla has summarized much of the literature treating this concept and tested a number of propositions relative to Latino identity via interviews with group leaders in the Chicago area.[10] For him "Latinismo" or Latino identity is a situational type of group identity and consciousness emerging from particular circumstances and social conditions that seem to demand social mobilization and even political action. Within this conceptualization of Latino ethnic identification are processes generating group awareness and solidarity depending largely upon structural influences in

the greater society (e.g. racial discrimination) that can act to bring Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, Cubans, and others together in concerted action designed to pursue commonly embraced goals.

Ethnicity here means a conscious sense of belonging on the basis of rather limited common factors (e.g. speaking Spanish) that from time to time may override one's specific attachment to an ethnic subgroup. The concept ethnicity, in this sense, may imply a strategic choice by individuals facing a common threat. Such forces may periodically unite Hispanics in Wichita vis a vis the activities of the Immigration and Naturalization Service that were covered previously. But ethnicity is not presumed to be a psychic phenomenon primordially determined.[11] Situational contexts (e.g. INS raids or the threat to end bilingual education in the schools or closing Wichita's Hispanic Clinic, were such to occur) would be expected to transcend individual, national, and cultural identities and unite Spanish-speaking people with others of Hispanic heritage in social mobilization for action, perhaps even formal political action.

This argument, of course, presumes the existence of sympathetic relationships among Spanish-speaking people that transcend their national origin and specific ethnic subgroup background. Padilla cites evidence of such simpatía. Yet the present author's experience with a wide range of Latin people points up many other evidences dramatizing a lack of such simpatía. Many so called Latinos resent each other's manner of speech, social customs, skin color, mannerisms, and national origin. This is a hard cold fact of social life that some Latins find uncomfortable to discuss publicly. (Argentine porteño treatment of Bolivians and Paraguayans is one of the more glaring cases in point that could be cited of ethnic discrimination among so called Latinos).

But it is nonetheless true that many Hispanics will exhibit a Latino

ethnic identification at times, perhaps intermittently, when the proper environmental stimuli are present..."in short, the Latino-conscious person sees himself as a Latino sometimes and as a Puerto Rican, Mexican-American, Cuban, and the like at other times."[12] The tendency, from Padilla's conceptualization, is for Latino identity to emerge as a political phenomenon. That parallels much of the evidence generated from our study here in Wichita. Where threats from discrimination and inequality pervade the larger society, it is to be expected that Latino identity may emerge and form cross-cutting alliances among distinct Hispanic ethnic subgroups simply as a common defensive strategy. But this is a far cry from arguing that all these subgroups instinctively have warm, loving feelings for each other just because they happen to be Hispanics.

"Latinismo," then, may form the basis for an ethnic-political community within the broader context of the American political system. The claim that "La Raza" exists, and or that "Aztlán" will exist, may be supra-ethnic claims to cultural unity within a political strategy context, i.e. "the social organization of Latino ethnicity represents an attempt to alter existing social and power arrangements between the Spanish-speaking and the larger American society."[13] Latino identity, then, becomes situationally specific and dependent, it is largely urban in setting, it is prone to become a political phenomenon, and it focuses in some way upon Spanish-speaking people. An internal influence potentially weakening to Latino social mobilization (vis a vis what Padilla calls a "political conflict population")[14] may be the defection of those who have ceased to speak Spanish, or never learned it, and who have eschewed other Hispanic ways in their drive to be accepted by and integrated into the larger Anglo-dominated society. Evidence of such breaking away emerges from our Wichita

study and specifically from the preliminary-attitudinal profile presented herein. Such cultural weakening and fragmentation may hold the key to future "Latinismo" as a lasting influence configuration holding relevant political power within the United States.[15]

TABLE D

PROMINENT WICHITA HISPANICS*

(a social and attitudinal profile)

VARIABLE	VALUE	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
1. Sex			
	Male	17	54.8
	Female	14	45.2
			100.0%
2. Age			
	Under 20	1	3.2
	21-30	10	32.3
	31-40	10	32.3
	41-50	3	9.7
	50+	6	19.3
	NR	1	3.2
			100.0%
3. Marital Status			
	married	24	77.4
	single	3	9.7
	widowed	2	6.4
	previously married	2	6.4
	NR	0	0.0
			99.9%
4. Current Residence			
	with parents	0	0.0
	with spouse	6	19.4
	with spouse and children	17	54.8
	live alone	5	16.1
	with non-related	2	6.4
	with relatives	1	3.2
			99.9%
5. Respondent's Children			
	none	7	22.6
	one	6	19.4
	two	4	12.9
	three	7	22.6
	four	3	9.7
	five	3	9.7
	six plus	1	3.2
			100.0%

*"Prominent Wichita Hispanics" includes reputationally identified well-known community members, civic activists, leaders, and public figures. Data distributions reported here are for 31 respondents out of a total of 42 solicited. Questionnaires administered April-May 1984 by Ken Johnson and Sherri Bayouth. Data compiled by John Hartman.

6. Respondent's Employment

yes	26	83.9
no	3	9.7
NR	2	6.4
		100.0%

7. Usual Type of Work

professional, technical, kindred	5	16.1
farmers and farm managers	0	0.0
managers, officials, proprietors	8	25.8
clerical workers	1	3.2
sales workers	0	0.0
craftsmen, foremen and kindred	2	6.4
operatives and kindred	2	6.4
private household workers	0	0.0
service workers	6	19.4
farm laborers and farm foremen	0	0.0
laborers except farm and mine	0	0.0
occupation not reported	7	22.6
		99.9%

8. Present Work is:

NA	10	32.3
only type ever done	1	3.2
temporary	4	12.9
part time	4	12.9
type I'll always do	12	38.7
		100.0%

9. Birthplace of Respondents:

	Parents		Grandparents	
	N	%	N	%
Mexico	15	48.4	19	61.3
Cuba	1	3.2	1	3.2
Puerto Rico	1	3.2	1	3.2
Panama	1	3.2	1	3.2
U.S.	6	19.4	1	3.2
Ecuador	3	9.7	3	9.7
Other	4	12.9	5	16.1
		100.0%		99.9%

10. Existence of Hispanic Community in Wichita

yes	30	96.7
no	0	0.0
don't know	1	3.2
		99.9%

11. Hispanic Identity of Respondent

yes	27	87.1
no	2	6.4
don't know	2	6.4
		99.9%

12. Ethnic Identity of Respondent

Mex.-Am.	20	64.5
Cuban	1	3.2
Puerto Rican	2	6.4
Other	8	25.8
		99.9%

13. Does R. Participate in Hispanic Affairs?

yes	28	90.3
no	2	6.4
NR	1	3.2
		99.9%

14. Frequency of Such Participation

regularly	12	38.7
occasionally	12	38.7
seldom	4	12.9
never	0	0.0
other	0	0.0
NR	3	9.7
		100.0%

15. Hispanic Organization Specified

named	20	64.5
none	11	35.5
see annex #15		100.0%

16. Confidence in Democratic Participation Process

very confident	12	38.7
moderately confident	13	41.9
discouraged	1	3.2
other	5	16.1
		99.9%

17. Most Effective Pro-Hispanic Organizations in Wichita

named	20	64.5
none	11	35.5
see annex #17		100.0%

18. Critical Public Policy Issues

named	25	80.6
none	6	19.4
see annex #18		100.0%

19. Do These Issues Concern Hispanics?

yes	26	83.9
no	0	0.0
don't know	5	16.1
		100.0%

20. Two Principal Internal Issues for Wichita

named issues	22	71.0
none named	0	0.0
don't know	8	29.0
see annex #20		100.0%

21. Existence of Illegal Aliens in Wichita

yes	30	96.8
no	0	0.0
don't know	1	3.2
		100.0%

22.	Illegal Aliens Depress Wages		
	yes	8	25.8
	no	21	67.7
	don't know	2	6.4
			99.9%
23.	They Deprive Others of Jobs		
	yes	0	0.0
	no	27	87.1
	don't know	4	12.9
			100.0%
24.	Simpson-Mazzoli Bill		
	favor	7	22.6
	oppose	16	51.6
	uncertain	5	16.1
	other	3	9.7
			100.0%
25.	Grant Amnesty to Illegals		
	favor	20	64.5
	oppose	3	9.7
	uncertain	8	25.8
	other	0	0.0
			100.0%
26.	National ID or Work Cards		
	favor	2	6.4
	oppose	18	58.1
	uncertain	9	29.0
	don't know	2	6.4
			99.9%
27.	A New Guest Worker Program		
	favor	19	61.3
	oppose	2	6.4
	uncertain	7	22.6
	other	3	9.7
			100.0%
28.	Stricter Border Enforcement		
	favor	9	29.0
	oppose	8	25.8
	uncertain	12	38.7
	NR	2	6.4
			99.9%
29.	How Illegal Aliens Fit in with Wichita Hispanics		
	quite well	3	9.7
	no problem	7	22.6
	no contacts	4	12.9
	ill adjusted	10	32.3
	other	6	19.4
	NA	1	3.2
			100.0%

30.	Social Services Referral		
	agency named	26	83.9
	none named	5	16.1
	see annex #30		100.0%
31.	Cultural Contribution by Spanish-Speaking Immigrants		
	yes	19	61.3
	no	6	19.4
	don't know	6	19.4
			100.1%
32.	Reluctant Association with New Immigrants		
	named	15	48.4
	none	16	51.6
	see annex #32		100.4%
33.	Newspaper Awareness		
	one named	25	80.6
	none	6	19.4
	see annex #33		100.00%
34.	Desired Cultural Changes in Wichita		
	named	26	83.9
	none	5	16.1
	see annex #34		100.0%
35.	Confident of Change Occuring		
	strongly confident	4	12.9
	moderately confident	12	38.7
	somewhat dubious	10	32.3
	very dubious	3	9.7
	NR	2	6.4
			100.0
36.	Fair Treatment for Local Hispanics		
	yes or named	20	64.5
	no	11	35.5
	NR	0	0.0
	see annex #36		100.0%
37.	Tendency Toward Natural Segregation Among Latinos		
	yes	7	22.6
	somewhat	9	29.0
	no	13	41.9
	don't know	2	6.4
			99.9%
38.	Deport Illegal Aliens?		
	yes	4	12.9
	no	19	61.3
	other	8	25.8
			100.0%

39. Special Consideration for Mexican Aliens?

favor	8	25.8
oppose	16	51.6
other	7	22.6
		100.0%

40. Legal Alien Status for Central American Refugees

favor	19	61.3
oppose	2	6.4
undecided	7	22.6
don't know	3	9.7
		100.0%

41. Church Sanctuaries Morally Justified?

yes	21	67.7
no	3	9.7
other	7	22.6
		100.0%

42. Aid to Mexico Effective?

very confident	1	3.2
confident	3	9.7
uncertain	10	32.2
doubtful	4	12.9
strongly doubtful	7	22.6
don't know	6	19.4
		100.0%

43. How Central American Refugees Received Here

welcomed	16	51.6
not welcomed	2	6.4
other	13	41.9
		99.9%

44. Should Pan-Hispanic Events be Promoted?

yes	22	71.0
no	2	6.4
other	7	22.6
		100.0%

45. Examples of Local Discrimination Against Hispanics

mentions	19	61.3
none	12	38.7
other	0	0.0
see annex #45		100.0%

46. Community Services Needed by Hispanics

mention	17	54.8
none	14	45.2
see annex #46		100.0%

47. Evaluation of Community Services

mention	22	71.0
none	9	29.0
see anex #47		100.0%

48. Have We Missed Anything?

mentions	14	45.2
none	17	54.8
		100.0%

ANNEX SCHEDULE

Annex #15. Hispanic Organizations Specified

El Perico 3
Hispanic Women's Network 7
LULAC 5
United Methodist Hispanic Ministries 1
Pan American Golf Association 1
Bilingual teachers 1
MECHA 1
Sigma Delta Phi 1
SER 5
NEDA 1
Latin American Educational Foundation 1

Annex #17. Most Effective Pro-Hispanic Organizations in Wichita

KACMAA 2
Churches (Generally) 2
Methodist Churches (generally) 5
SER 5
Hispanic Women's Network 3
LULAC 4
G.I. Forum 1
MECHA 1
Our Lady of Perpetual Help 1
NEDA 2
Chamber of Commerce 1

Annex #18. Critical Public Policy Issues

unemployment 15
immigration 2
racial discrimination 6
federal deficits 1
nuclear war 1
cultural issues 2
housing 1
crime 1
taxes 3
Wolf Creek 4
economic opportunity 1
Simpson-Mazzoli Bill 1
medical and legal aid 3
EEO enforcement 1
education 3
police protection 2
affirmative action 1
street repair 2
Asians (in Wichita) 1
Riverside development 1
drunk drivers 1
pornography 1
city commissioners 6

Annex #20. Internal Issues for Wichita Hispanics

questioning of one's legal status 1
job discrimination 6
education 3
getting organized 2
employment access 4
immigration 2
cohesiveness 1
goal orientation (specification) 1
local government 2
group recognition 1
leadership needed 1
Wolf Creek 1
lack of communication 2
public programs 1
bilingual schools 1
language problems 1
documentation 1
political action 1
social activities 1

Annex #31. Cultural contribution of new Spanish-speaking immigrants.

authentication 1
preservation of relationships 1
culture kept alive 10
food interest 4
language 3
music 3
values 1

Annex #30. Preferred referral of Spanish-speaking immigrants.

United Methodist Urban Ministries 11
SER 8
Hispanic Women's Network 2
Headstart 1
NEDA 1
LULAC 1
Catholic Social Services 5
Operation Success (WSU) 1
Our Lady of Perpetual Help 4

Annex #32. Reluctant Association with New Immigrants

personal relations examples 1
restaurants 1
some Mexican clubs 1
illegals and foreign students 1
different classes and backgrounds 1
cases of vague heritage or lack thereof 1
inadequate background for mixing 1
dictated by Mexican caste system 1
cases of single men 1

Annex #33. Awareness of Newspaper for Hispanics

El Perico rated: poor 2, good 4, excellent 4, fair 3, biased 1

Other 5

Annex #34. Desired Cultural Changes in Wichita

better T.V. exposure 3
more aggressive Hispanics 1
grammar improvements 1
communications improvements 4
greater public decision involvement 1
better human relations 3
unifications of Hispanics 7
educational improvements 4
improved religious services 1
economic betterment 1
political awareness 1
cultural enrichment 3
enhanced women's roles 1

Annex #36. Fairness of Treatment for Hispanics Comparatively.

Negative responses were as follows:

Vietnamese treated better 1
too much prejudice 1
unfairness prevalent throughout the USA 1
Hispanic stereotypes are nefarious 1
blacks and others have more recognition 3
larger city Hispanics have more clout 1
Hispanics too passive and/or divided to demand fairness 3
empathy must be fostered among non-Hispanics 1
Catholic Church in Wichita favors Orientals 1
lack of language hinders 2

Annex #45. Examples of Local Discrimination Against Hispanics

police relations 8
employment 3
no translation of job rights materials 1
restaurant owner 2
worker compensation for injury 1
rental property 1
exploitation by farmers 1
educational problems 2
jobs & hiring generally 1
ethnic discrimination 1
no Hispanic directory 1

Annex #46. Community Services Needed by Hispanics

medical - legal 4
support for Hispanic businessmen 1
dental clinic 1
alcoholism treatment 1
early bilingual education 2
Hispanic radio and television 4
neighborhood rebuilding 1
Hispanic chamber of commerce-national tie-in 1

Annex #47. Evaluation of Existing Community Services

good 8
poor 7
fair 2
moderate 1
rotten 1
twice the services needed 1

Annex #48. Have We Missed Anything?

lack of media attention 1
political involvement 1
block grant monies 1
educational aspirations 2
acculturation survey 1
the SER-Jobs for PROGRESS needs to be investigated 1

FOOTNOTES CHAPTER FOUR

1. John J. Hartman and Jack H. Hedblom, Methods for the Social Sciences, Westport, Connecticut, Greenwood Press, 1979, p. 7.

2. Ibid., p. 27.

3. SER Jobs for Progress, Report of the Hispanic Survey in the City of Wichita, 1979, p. 25.

4. Harriett Romo, "The Mexican Origin Population's Differing Perceptions of their Children's Schooling," Social Science Quarterly, 65, No. 2, June, 1984.

5. Rodolfo O. de la Garza, Chicano Political Elite Perceptions of the Undocumented Worker: An Empirical Analysis, San Diego, University of California, Program in United States-Mexican Studies, 1981, p. 18.

6. The Wichita Eagle-Beacon, September 30, 1980.

7. Harris News Service Release, Hutchinson, Kansas, February 4, 1984.

8. The Wichita Eagle-Beacon, September 29, 1980.

9. Partial additional support for this contention is found in Lawrence W. Miller, Jerry L. Polinard, and Robert D. Wrinkle, "Attitudes Toward Undocumented Workers: The Mexican-American Perspective," Social Science Quarterly, June, 1984, Vol. 65, No. 2, pp. 482-494.

10. Felix M. Padilla, "On the Nature of Latino Ethnicity," Social Science Quarterly, June, 1984, Vol. 65, No. 2, pp. 651-664.

11. Ibid., pp. 653-54.

12. Ibid., p. 655.

13. Ibid., p. 662.

14. Ibid.

15. Concerning interpretation of the preliminary data contained in this profile, here is a precautionary note added by John J. Hartman:

> We have tried to caution the reader not to make inferences to the larger Hispanic population based on the data from the notables examined in this chapter. At the same time we believe the data do well reflect the characteristics and attitudes of the elite group. We believe results would not be significantly changed even if the other 11 persons had responded. Hence, comparisons or evaluations made on this leadership group should probably be contrasted with Hispanic leaders in other communities or with the [redacted] Hispanic leaders in Wichita or other communities. For example, future research on the non-leadership Hispanics may indicate that there is perceived animosity over jobs, services and economic concerns between the lower working class Hispanic and the illegal alien group. Such conclusions and other conclusions must await completion of relevant ongoing work.

CHAPTER FIVE

IMPACT AND INTEGRATION: SOME PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS ON THE CONTINUING HISPANIC IMMIGRATION INTO WICHITA, KANSAS

On the Impact of Clandestine Mexican Migrants. Probing the daily orbit of an illegal Mexican alien's life, we can extract considerable knowledge as to his or her impact on a given community and its ethnic components. I remind the reader that in a sequel to this report it is my intention to develop a penetrating description of the life-styles and needs of these Hispanic sojourners in our midst. A Spanish language questionnaire is now being carefully administered among a select clientele group (randomly chosen) of Spanish-speaking Mexican migrants. Along with other unstructured interviews both in Kansas and in Mexico, this activity will generate the basis for the culturally well-anchored profile we hope to develop. An adjunct of this will be more extensive measurements and estimates of the community impact of the clandestine migration both in Wichita and throughout Kansas. We expect also to establish firm estimates of the degree of dependency which certain families and localities in Mexico maintain vis a vis financial remittances sent from Kansas.

Also, I should stress a major caveat that was entered earlier. Neither I, nor professors John Hartman, James McKenney, or anyone else associated with this project, employ the terms "illegal aliens" for disparaging, pejorative, or otherwise racist purposes. But to study an illegal-clandestine population without calling it that serves no heuristic purpose that we know of, nor does it minimize the important contribution to America which we freely admit these people are making. Indeed, it is Professor Johnson's strong suspicion that the clandestine migration stream may be bringing the

best of Mexico's human resources to the United States. That contention will be evaluated as our research continues.

For now, let us examine briefly a family of IMAs (illegal Mexican aliens) living in Wichita who are believed typical, this on the basis of wide ranging interviews over more than a year with other such families in the area. This will be an incomplete but reasonably concrete profile of one set of clandestine Hispanic migrants to Wichita who have put down visible roots here and whose presence is part of an historic process of coming and going that has involved several generations of an entire family over a number of years.

The family in question, as will be seen, has made a definite impact here in Wichita and this has been reciprocated by the community. To protect the basic human rights of the persons involved in this discussion, I have chosen to assign them pseudonyms, but the basic facts are accurate as I have observed them and as they emerge from the many hours we have spent in friendly discourse and introspection. Quite obviously, a great measure of mutual human trust, generosity, and good will underlies this presentation. Typical of migrant Hispanics in Wichita are members of the Nájera-Galván family from the state of Michoacán located in west-central Mexico. They are from the locality (municipio) of Angamacutiro but their people live in tiny pueblos ranging from the capital city of Morelia to Lake Pátzquaro. Michoacán is often cited in the literature on migration (see Chapters One and Two) as a principal Mexican sending state for clandestine migrants who settle or sojourn in Kansas and across the Great Plains.

As the story was told to me, back in the 1930s, someone's maternal grandmother married an American citizen from Indiana, thereby achieving a legal status base on which to bring other family members to the United

States. This "foothold couple" moved to Kansas in the 1940s in response to a demand for skilled labor in the growing aviation industry during World War II. At that point, a definite foothold was established in Wichita for other family members (including those related by blood, marriage, or friendship) of the Nájera-Galván group who kept coming to Wichita in search of work. Support people, thus, were waiting in Wichita to help others from the village who wanted to come. This security at "trail's end" made the hazards of illegal river and desert crossings somewhat less discouraging as the migrants could feel that at the end of the line there would be a personal family welcome and a physical refuge for them should they finally make it to Wichita.

Members of the family stressed to me that no one in the native-born U.S. citizen community of Hispanics in Wichita aided them in coming here or in getting themselves established socially upon arrival. There were, however, local Hispanics, especially during the war years who aided the newcomers in finding employment and in providing meeting places, often commercial in nature, where Hispanic newcomers could mix and develop friendships. Several local churches also lent themselves to the early integration process.

An identifiable community of Nájera-Galván clan members (family, extended family, close friends) developed in several sectors of Wichita. At the time of our interviews in 1984 and 1985, these addresses could be plotted on a city map delineating an urban zone of roughly 3 blocks square in what is loosely known as Wichita's Midtown district. However, the employment of these Nájera-Galván people did not correspond at all to that area in which they lived. Commonly they found employment of an unskilled nature all over Wichita, including roofing and painting companies, small manufacturing concerns, hotels, and especially, restaurants. Interestingly,

few if any of the Nájera-Galváns in 1984 were employed in Mexican-style restaurants.

Of about 11 family members interviewed, four were housewives and not salaried, five men worked as kitchen helpers in restaurants, and two had employment involving sheet metal and glass construction. None of these people worked for local defense contractors. Among them they had about 17 children and at least half of these were U.S.-born (of the remainder I have as yet been unable to make a determination as to alienage but some are surely illegals). The Nájera-Galván family nucleus has at least 9 children attending the Wichita Public Schools. All of the members of the immediate family located in Wichita, which I estimate at about 19 people, have at one time or another been clients of the Hispanic Clinic run by the United Methodist Urban (Hispanic) Ministries, discussed in Chapter Three. I have not been able to determine exactly the total size of the Nájera-Galván clan here in Wichita, but excluding friends who are not compadrazgo partners in the extended family, the group's size must be about 30 counting all generations. An exact census of these people may be included in the sequel to this report.

All the men, and several of the women, have employment, some of it part-time. It is common practice for these people to fill in for each other at their places of employment almost routinely should someone get picked up by "la migra", the INS, and sent back to Mexico. In late 1984, a carload of Nájera-Galván family people returned to Michoacán for the Christmas holidays, possessing what they said they believed to be valid U.S. immigration documents. They left the U.S. "con papeles" as the saying went. But upon attempting reentry in January, 1985, the story took a negative turn. The so-called "papers" for which they had paid a Texas attorney handsomely, were bogus and confiscated. The bearers, along

with their Kansas-registered vehicle were turned back at the U.S. border and told to "go through proper channels." That, of course, would not include surreptitious crossing of the Rio Grande (and besides, what would they do with their vehicle?)

During all this time a son of one couple in the group remained in Wichita working at his father's job as a dishwasher in a steak house kitchen so that his father wouldn't lose that employment. That son, in turn, needed intermittent help from other family members in holding onto his own job at another restaurant so that it would not pass "out of the family." Were these jobs other than menial ones it is questionable whether the employers would have tolerated such personnel substitution. But restaurant managers in Wichita seem to enjoy having a floating pool of Mexicans around to keep their kitchens running. One restaurant manager told our researcher, Donna Burger, that the kitchen support positions of a well-known restaurant chain in Wichita would definitely be open to Spanish-speaking people and that unless the given job required direct contact with the English-speaking public there would be no problem whatsoever, thus many such jobs are readily open to the IMAs.[1]

The Mexicans can be, and are, typically called at all hours of the day and night and required to come in to work. Rudimentary English and Spanish such as "Tex-Mex" or "Spanglish" are employed for communication. Sleep patterns are routinely interrupted. This makes it hard for the Mexicans to plan any sort of a regular social life, something U.S. citizen workers probably would not tolerate for long. There are some adverse health consequences for the Mexican workers in the Nájera-Galván group who are subject to such demands. Some have told me they would prefer to work in the fields if it weren't for the seasonal nature of such work. They believe that agricultural work is generally healthier.

The people of the Nájera-Galván group live in what most Americans would consider poor housing. Many occupy apartments built into garages on back alleys behind other residences. The homes I have visited are usually clean inside but the outside and nearby environs are commonly strewn with trash. In one instance, there are too many people occupying a 2-room apartment and one or more men will often sleep outside in a van to make room for women and younger children inside. The place is full of cracks admitting spiders, rats, and roaches. The Nájera-Galván situation is much better than that of other families in North Wichita, some of whom sleep in abandoned vehicles and shacks with only the most rudimentary of heating and poor hygenic conditions. But such extreme conditions are, fortunately, fairly rare. Where they do exist they pose obvious threats to public health.[2]

However, even in the case of the Nájera-Galván clan who are fairly well off, relatively speaking, I have seen persons living in extremely close quarters alongside others having contagious diseases. The former then are potential disease carriers who go to work daily in restaurant kitchens. Again, the public health impact potential is fairly obvious. Fortunately, the Methodist-run Clínica Hispana is available to them, albeit on a once-a-week basis. At times I have calculated the immediate income for a five person family unit of one set of Nájera-Galváns as running well above the qualification limits of the Methodist Clínica Hispana. But periodically someone will lose a job and the income drops sharply. The clinic, then, has periodic "rescreening" checks to determine who is poor enough to be eligible. The problem is that the clinic is kind of a cultural center for the Hispanics. To tell them they can't come because their income has gone up would be cruel. But here is a dilemma for the Methodists which they undoubtedly share with such service ministries

in other cities.

The Nájera-Galváns have left their impact on local law enforcement in Wichita although nothing of a severe nature has yet transpired for them in particular. This author has been called, on the basis of personal friendship ties established with them, to intervene as an interpreter in a number of police and court situations. Occasionally, this has approached the dispensing of legal counsel, something the author is not licensed to do. But the hard cold realities of human relations often transcend legal niceties and if, for instance, the author is asked to explain to a judge that a person who can't read English might ignore a traffic ticket summons, this can be handled informally and effectively without paying a lawyer. In fact that Nájera-Galván extended family group has on more than a few occasions placed this author in the position of having to lecture them on the illegality of drinking beer while driving on the streets of Wichita. And in this area, the family has experienced several arrests that were clearly transgressions of their own making.

In the sequel to this report, we will attempt to estimate the economic impact of Mexican families like the Nájera-Galván group in terms of salaries earned, taxes paid, and funds remitted to Mexico. Moreover, I plan to refine the methodology I used earlier[3] for studying financial repatriation to Mexico with the goal of specifying just how much Mexican dependency is linked to the employment of clandestine migrants here in Wichita.

Tentatively, for the five person nucleus of the Nájera-Galván family cited above (two of whom are preschool children), I have estimated that on the basis of an average total family income of $750 per month, the three wage-earners send back about $200 totally per month on which the livelihood of 8 other people (ages unknown) in Mexico depends. A long

and delicate process of developing the trust is needed to extract data of this sort which are valid. That will be a major part of the sequel to this study.

Many Wichitans voice the suspicion that the clandestine migrants, especially those from Mexico, contribute to America's growing pool of permanently unemployed either by displacing U.S. citizens or by becoming street people themselves. The latter assertion seems not to be the case, at least not in Wichita. A recent press report contended, to the contrary, that "street people are getting younger, police and social workers agree. Most are white males. About a fifth are black. Fewer than 8 percent are Mexican or Indian."[4] Illegal Mexican aliens tend to congregate in Wichita's north midtown area where cheap housing abounds. Often many families live in a single dwelling. We have catalogued such addresses. There are relatively few real "street people" in Hispanic Wichita ghetto area, this is in the sense of people forced to sleep in doorways or in precarious structures of their own creation. Private refuge centers exist near the area, like Venture House on North Emporia and the Rescue Mission on North St. Francis Street, but these report that the great majority of their clients are non-Hispanic.

The Hispanic poor seem to creep-and-cluster together. Private informal networks offer protection. Their most visible public tie-in is the Clínica Hispana and informal outreach center at St. Paul's United Methodist Church, with its related counselling function, most of which is provided by unpaid volunteers. A plotting of addresses of clients of that clinic, done especially for this project, shows heavy clustering around 13th and Broadway, the center of Wichita's Midtown, and the location of the Clínica Hispana screening facility at St. Paul's United Methodist Church. The clustering then extends north to about 36th St. and south,

thinning out considerably, to the lower Broadway area of south Wichita. There appears to be a corridor about 6 to 10 blocks wide running from south to north in which most of the Spanish-speaking migrants in Wichita live. Only a very few are scattered into the outlying sectors of the city. The social service impact, therefore, is highly concentrated geographically. The need for transportation is likewise concentrated. But employment locales are widely dispersed. Public transportation in the city is inadequate to handle the ride-to-work needs of these people. Providing such transportation may be the next social service outreach function of churches in Wichita.

The demand for law enforcement is similarly concentrated in Midtown and north Wichita, yet the Spanish-speaking migrants generally cause relatively little trouble for police. The principal exception seems to be those club-style taverns which cater to Mexicans from Mexico. In such establishments, most of them in north Wichita, fights and shootings are common. Much of this stems from feuds the migrants brought from Mexico. Other violence is attributed to competition over jobs and women. The proprietors of two Mexican clubs refused to be interviewed for this project. But the impression is strong that illegal Mexican aliens as a social aggregate cause relatively few serious problems for the Wichita police and that most of the conflict between the aliens is resolved outside formal judicial procedures. For instance, as reported earlier in another context, it is often reported that wounded Mexicans have been driven back to the Mexican border for treatment rather than risk having their alienage revealed by seeking local medical help. Clients of the Clínica Hispana, it should be added, are almost never found in such an emergency condition that would require informing law enforcement authorities.

Spanish-speaking migrants from Mexico and Central America do occupy a considerable body of rental housing that most U.S. citizens would find

precarious at best. It is not uncommon to find Mexicans paying around $200 per month (plus utilities or a share therein) for a single-room efficiency apartment having separate bath and kitchen but with the most rudimentary furnishings and located on a back alley or built onto an existing garage. Reports are common of houses divided into four apartments with 6 to 12 people of all ages occupying any or all of those given units. We expect to do a more precise analysis of the housing impact of the Spanish-speaking migrants in the migrant ghetto area of Wichita's Midtown and throughout Kansas in the sequel to this report and have amassed a card file of addresses repeatedly used by Spanish-speaking migrants. Suffice it to note that a considerable amount of rent money is being paid to local landlords for the use of unfit rental property, much of which clearly would not pass a safety inspection by the City of Wichita.

The present writer has visited some of this housing. He was told that under threat of being turned over to the INS, the renters feared to complain to the landlord about broken windows and toilets, exposed wiring and sinking foundations. Some of those slumlords are themselves Hispanics. But if all the illegals were to be suddenly removed from Wichita it would make a serious dent in the income of many slumlords who live by exploiting these desperate people. One of our future goals is to calculate the total rent paid by IMAs in Wichita.

Other impact dimensions involve claims that illegal aliens in Wichita, and throughout Kansas generally, swindle state agencies, hence the public treasury through fraudulent receipt of welfare benefits. Some of these claims appear exaggerated and misleading. An example is found in a press release that was circulated throughout the state during mid-1984 by the Kansas Department of Human Resources. It claims that a new fraud detection program enabled the agency to "show that a potential of $1,704,825

in payments to illegal aliens were prevented since June 1, 1983." The press release further states that a number (36 cases) of fraudulent claims for Unemployment Insurance Benefits were referred by the agency to county district attorneys for prosecution. What the press release does not say is that any of those cases included illegal aliens. NOR DOES IT SAY that any of the above million dollars-plus figure of potential payments was ever made to an illegal alien.[5]

The author pursued this matter in a letter to the Kansas Department of Human Resources dated September 14, 1984, asking for an exact figure indicating how many illegal aliens (plus their country of origin) had actually been caught getting Unemployment Insurance Benefits fraudulently in Kansas. The response I got was that only potential fraud has been detected and that illegal aliens were not eligible for Unemployment Insurance Benefits in Kansas.[6] In point of fact, then, the Kansas Department of Human Resources had apparently caught absolutely no illegal aliens cheating the state as of the date of that correspondence, at least not in the area of the state's Unemployment Insurance Benefits program. But the agency's press release gave out a very different impression, that its new "detection systems" were protecting Kansans against fraud (albeit, potential fraud) committed by illegal aliens.

It is noteworthy that illegal aliens are not eligible for Unemployment Insurance Benefits in Kansas. Yet to employ these illegal aliens is still permitted under federal law and permitted under Kansas law if the employer doesn't know they are illegals. Thus the illegals are worked at low wages for the benefit of employers, they pay state and local taxes, but get no Unemployment Insurance Benefits. It would appear, then, that the illegal Mexican aliens (IMAs) are subsidizing this unemployment program in Kansas to the extent that they are actually prevented from collecting any such

benefits. There may, then, be a certain hypocrisy implicit in an agency boasting of "catching" those who are inadvertently helping to subsidize that very agency. This issue will receive further study in our sequel. It is stressed here to show the use to which the illegal alien presence can be put as a self-serving device in building prestigeful imagery for an agency.

Since the dates of the above correspondence, there has been one discovery by this author of an illegal Mexican alien (IMA) receiving unemployment compensation for several months after he had been laid off from seasonal labor with a construction company. Again here is the irony. His employment was not illegal (for the employer). But it was illegal for the IMA to be an employee himself. He had been a good employee, paid state, federal, and Social Security taxes, and was then found temporarily eligible for unemployment compensation. This came to an end with receipt of a "job service letter" (which I translated for him) saying he would need to supply "work permit papers" or else have his unemployment payments ended (and they were ended).

Had it been clearly illegal to hire the man in the first place, with genuine enforcement of that law, then the inequity would not have occurred. But of course neither would the man have been able to support himself nor remit money back home. Passage of the proposed Simpson-Mazzoli Act would eliminate this dilemma. But it would be severely damaging to the people of Mexico; perhaps America cannot afford to risk such consequences, and they are considerable in both socioeconomic and political terms.

Finally, let us note briefly two other areas of impact in which segments of the Wichita community occasionally behave poorly toward the IMAs. The first is legal abuse. The words "notary public" in Mexico refer to a person who can perform many of the functions which attorneys perform in

the United States. There are frequently reports here in Kansas of notaries who exploit illegal aliens and charge them for services which can never be provided. In all fairness, this charge against notaries is more commonly found coming out of the state of Texas than here in Kansas. But what frequently is the case here in Wichita, however, is that the illegal aliens will simply be ripped off by local attorneys who promise to "try to arrange papers" for people who clearly have no claim to legal immigrant status and these people are frequently charged exorbitantly. In other instances we have found aliens who were charged by attorneys hundreds of dollars to fill out papers which the various government agencies will either do free or for a modest service charge. The present writer has investigated several cases of such abuse of illegal aliens by lawyers, a few of whom, ironically, turned out to be Hispanics themselves. Our sequel study will also probe further into this line of inquiry.

The second area of negative impact could be lumped under the general rubric of immoral human abuse. Persons of illegal alienage have been injured on the job and employers have staunchly refused to provide any positive response. One woman, employed by a local hospital for several years, was refused medical attention (or so she claimed to several listeners) at that facility after she had slipped on a wet floor. Other IMAs have been forced to work long hours in restaurants without being permitted to eat, even if they offered to pay for the food. They had to bring their lunch and eat it outside regardless of the weather. There have been several cases of people doing work and later refused their pay. Some IMA women have been reported being denied a stool to sit on when doing kitchen work not requiring a person to stand at all times and this during advanced months of pregnancy. Others, mostly male IMAs, have reported physical abuse by job foremen and some have come into the Clínica Hispana

with evidence that they had been abused. Finally, a number of alien females report they are extorted for sexual "favors" by men in a variety of roles under the threat of being turned over to the INS or of losing their jobs. Again, we plan to examine the extent of such nefarious practices in the last part of this study. Those interviews and field work are now underway.

Commentaries on This Study From Local Observers. As we reach toward a sequel to this report leading to a more definitive study of the migrant Hispanic impact in Kansas and the Great Plains, the views of interested scholarly observers must be taken into account. For purposes of this concluding chapter, the author solicited comments of a number of Wichitans who were recommended to me for their intellectual and professional integrity and for the respect they command among their peers. For the most part, they read only chapters three and four of the present report and their comments should be understood within that limitation.

George Doyle is a distinguished veteran newscaster and radio broadcaster holding the title Director of Information and Public Affairs at Radio Station KFH in Wichita; that station is a highly respected radio voice said to be the oldest radio station in Kansas. Doyle gave permission for inclusion of the following:

> I was impressed by the depth of Kenneth Johnson's research into the Hispanic Community in Wichita and by the number of personal interviews he has conducted.
>
> While he may appear to be a bit heavy-handed in his assessment of Wichita police dealings not only with IMAs but with Hispanics in general, I find his conclusions to be right on target in that particular area, having witnessed some of them at first hand as a member of the Wichita news media and as a citizen of this community for more than three decades.
>
> Johnson's concern that ". . . the richness of the Hispanic culture be saved, honored, but not emasculated or permanently sullied through capricious and haphazard mixing with the Anglo culture. . ." is certainly a valid concern in Wichita. The trend in recent years, as I perceive it, has been a tendency on the part of much of the

Wichita Hispanic community to deny, or at least conceal as best they can, their "Hispanicness" for whatever reason. Some Hispanics have told me they simply want to distance themselves from the IMA controversy, an over-simplified explanation in my opinion.

The fact that a present Wichita City Commissioner and former mayor and state legislator goes to great lengths to conceal his Hispanic ancestry may not necessarily reflect the majority attitude of the Wichita Hispanic community, but it is a prime example of how Wichita Hispanics are divided on that issue.

This work may do much to heal that divisiveness.[7]

Bernice Hutcherson, a scholar and member of the black community, is a popular sociology/social work professor at Wichita State University. Her comments, reproduced below, will be especially valuable in the future work we have planned:

Due to my longstanding observation of and occasional work with Wichita's Hispanic community I appreciate your sharing this preliminary study with me. It was the middle 1960's when I first became personally acquainted with some of their alleged leaders through my work as a member, and later the only female chairperson, of the Wichita Area Community Action Program, Inc., Board of Directors. I have continued to observe actions and interactions of these alleged leaders from afar. Your study lends credence to some of the opinions I have formed based on my observation of activities within the Wichita Hispanic community through past years. Additionally I worked as the faculty case consultant to students Nelly E. Segura, Tana R. Fender and Marie A. Elossais who spent volunteer time in the programs of Our Lady of Perpetual Help and St. Paul's United Methodist Church.

Your treatment of the depth of feelings of U.S. citizen Hispanics in that they were being unduly harassed by local law enforcement officers, that anyone who looked Mexican could be embarrassed and even physically assaulted, is extremely well-documented through the verified examples you have selected to use. Although it does not unduly detract from your text per se, I did feel a bit disoriented by being drawn so abruptly from a historic 1969 all the way back to "during the 1950's" in paragraph two on page five.

In a work such as this one it is most often necessary to look to the local printed media as a basic resource. It is apparent that you have cited not only the most notorious but also a number of less notorious articles to establish a well-rounded background out of which the negative feelings of the Wichita Hispanic community against law enforcement officers has evolved.

The fact that you so clearly implicated illegal aliens who violently settled long standing feuds in several northside clubs as a significant factor in the disturbed interracial feelings is a point that has lacked such clarity in any former report known to me. Your follow-up recording

of frustration over concern about how the new immigrants were treated by the established Hispanics, as well as by law enforcement officers, is very helpful in trying to understand the real multi-cultural bind(s) the combined Hispanic community must feel. This clear treatise is particularly enlightening to the reader. It helps us to understand some of the ambivalent actions in spite of an occasional prejudicial remark so typically heard while visiting informally with a variety of persons of the Hispanic population.

It is my opinion that substantially few of the general American public have any real understanding of the significance of media reports relative to ESL and Bilingual Education programs within our educational system. This work briefly and clearly points out the methodological and ideological differences which ultimately, and at the same time, spell success or failure for the most important element in both programs --the Hispanic child.

It is becoming colloquially recognized that with the worldwide picture of assassination of "leaders," such as President J.F. Kennedy, M. Gandhi and M.L. King, Jr. etc., particular groups recognize that a fairly large number of their population possess leadership ability and that has become a sometimes painful reality for them.

Inherent in such wider recognition of leadership ability are the seeds of divergent philosophies. This study, almost unwittingly, explicates that phenomenon.

Although broad inferences cannot be made on the basis of this preliminary study (due particularly to the selectivity of the interview group through the mushrooming of the reputational method of asking one respondent to recommend another prominent Hispanic) there appears to be a high correlation between those interviewed and the high percentage of their ability to come together on the questionnaire variables which indicate their high level of knowledge and deep concern about cultural and policy issues concerning local Hispanics which adds a measure of credibility to this study.

Overall, this preliminary study provides a realistic, well-documented look at the common but separate specters of prejudice and discrimination which continually haunt minorities of color within our urban metropolitan areas which must attempt to adapt and respond to their varied human needs.[8]

Maria Blanco de Balderas is a Cuban-born naturalized U.S. citizen who came to this country in 1967 when she was 13 years old with her parents who sought to escape the Castro regime. She was educated in the Wichita Public Schools and inevitably experienced some of the problems of ethnic discrimination which, she feels, were never too severe in her case. Ms. Balderas later graduated from Kansas Newman College and became active in public

service activities in Wichita. She is currently Director of the Hispanic Women's Program at SER (Jobs for Progress) Incorporated which is a not-for-profit agency contracting with federal, state, and local governments for provision of vocational training to Hispanics. These are her comments on chapters three and four of this report:

> It is not enough to talk of immigration reform alone as is often done. Instead we should consider it in its relation to U.S. foreign policy toward some of the countries which send clandestine immigrants to the United States and here to Kansas as Professor Johnson has been studying. It is quite possible that some countries whose people leave and come to the United States might have been able to keep those same people at home if independent national development had been possible. I mean to say development that would be free of control and interference from the United States and other world powers. The Vietnamese people here in Kansas, just like the Cubans, fled their country after American interventions failed. If they had, from the beginning, been allowed to develop their nations in their own ways and without foreign interference they might not have gone Communist. It is a mistake to assume that every revolution is Communist. Some revolutions are genuinely reformist and designed to meet the needs of the people; this is probably the case in Nicaragua and El Salvador today, but continued U.S. interference in those countries will generate more refugees and may, in the end, force them into Communist dictatorships as occurred in Vietnam. Obviously, then, there will be refugees.
>
> For this reason it is wrong for Hispanics to resent the Vietnamese minorities in the United States who have been given preferential treatment as refugees by the government. Rather than harbor resentment we Hispanics should unite to promote common goals in defense of our own ethnic heritage which is a source of great dignity and pride to us. We should work together to help those less fortunate Hispanics among us to achieve their aspirations, Professor Johnson's study refers to discrimination among the various subgroups of Hispanics themselves. This occurs and is a mistake as one discrimination simply breeds another and prevents us from uniting to solve common problems.
>
> After reading chapters three and four of this report, I came to the conclusion that illegal migration is a major problem facing Hispanics in America today, and it is a problem that may continue to divide us if we don't control the highly nationalistic pride which we bring with us from our various countries. Pride in our country of origin is a good thing, but it should not become a basis for discrimination or for conflict between us.
>
> Finally, let me note that much is said about illegal aliens who take jobs away from Americans and legal resident aliens. Less is said about the taxes these illegals pay, the important services they provide (which in many cases, according to what I have read and seen, are jobs that most Americans will not perform), and the products they help to produce at reasonable prices. One of the great virtues of America is its ethnic

> diversity. Most of the illegal aliens are sojourners, at least those from Mexico and Central America, who are saving money to be able to return to their countries and make a better life for themselves. They also send money back to feed others who, without that assistance, might be forced to migrate. While the migrants are here they contribute to the cultural richness of America and make important social and economic contributions which should not be overlooked.[9]

Kimberly A. Johnston is a graduating senior in International Studies at Wichita State University in 1985. She also is coordinator of ESL (English as a Second Language) programs for the United Methodist Urban Ministries and in this capacity is often called upon to perform a number of related social outreach functions. Her commentary on chapters three and four is as follows:

> Chapter three, "Today's Hispanic Community in Wichita," provides an accurate description of the relationship between the Hispanics in the community and law enforcement agencies. Through my involvement in the Hispanic community, I have encountered similar cases of discrimination. In addition, a reduction of the bilingual program at Park School is incompatible with a growing Hispanic population in need of bilingual education.
>
> Professor Johnson addresses the problems facing the Hispanic population in Wichita both with law enforcement agencies and in the school system. I would like to point out that other problems such as discrimination on the job and economic pressures resulting in problems in the home should also be addressed in the study. In reference to the latter, there is a need for counselling for the Hispanic needy who are facing both economic pressures as well as adaption to a new environment. One result of the environmental pressures which migrant Hispanics confront is severe anxiety and stress leading to emotional and mental illness. Volunteer service organizations have an important opportunity to meet this community need by providing bilingual outreach workers to mediate problems encountered between the Spanish-speaking low-income groups and the larger Wichita community.[10]

The Reverend James M. Bell is executive director of the Inter-Faith Ministries of Wichita, Kansas. His organization seeks to provide liaison and clearinghouse functions between the member churches which include nearly all religious faiths represented in the Wichita area. Bell is particularly concerned with the plight of needy Hispanics as evidenced by the following stricture from his organization's own Constitution, pledging Inter-Faith

Ministries to "creating mutual understanding; identifying and working to alleviate human suffering and injustice and providing relationships from which can emerge worship and celebration." (Constitution and By-Laws, Article II, Section 2). The following comments are his reaction to chapters three and four of this report.

> In many instances your research confirms the concerns that some of us have regarding continuing racism and harassment. I believe, however, that much of the wider Wichita community shares these concerns and is trying to address the issues.
>
> Even as your research is prepared for publication, El Perico (May, 1985) points out the probable elimination of the Bilingual Program at one elementary school and a number of other failures of the public school system to meet the needs of the Hispanic Community. I hope you will continue to monitor the effects these cuts in the school programs have on Hispanic children. My fear is that we are adversely affecting their ability to become productive citizens by shortchanging them in their early years of public education.
>
> In a letter to me you raised a question about religious divisiveness regarding aliens generally. That divisiveness is beginning to build particularly in congregations where groups have studied Central America. Several clergy have commented that the intensity of feeling about issues regarding aliens and sanctuary have caused them to be very cautious in their own stances (and particularly in raising such concerns from the pulpit). It appears to me that Mexican-Americans do not receive as much sympathy or support in the wider community as do Hispanics from Central American countries.
>
> A number of congregations have initiated specialized ministries for minorities. In your research you indicate that there is generally more sympathy for Asians than Hispanics. I note the same attitude is often present in specialized ministries to minorities where there is more excitement about ministries with Asians than with Hispanics. After some reflection on that, I have come to believe that part of that excitement is because of the potential for conversions among Asians from their Buddhist religion to Christianity. That potential is generally not present among Hispanics since many of them are already Christian.
>
> I believe the sanctuary movement will be an issue that the Wichita religious community will have to address in the near future. Already a small group helps support a sanctuary in Concordia, Kansas, on the grounds of a Catholic convent. One group in Wichita, the Religious Coalition for Social Action, has had programs and conversations about Central America, and some members of the Coalition are convinced sanctuary is the next step to be taken. My conversations with colleagues who are in judicatory offices convince me that sanctuary is potentially an extremely divisive issue. Even in instances where religious bodies nationally have taken pro-sanctuary positions, that has not necessarily translated into local or regional agreement.

> Your research will be useful to many segments of the wider community. Thank you for the time and effort you have spent. I look forward to following your continuing research regarding the Hispanic Community.[11]

In reference to the above comments by Reverend Bell, the reader should note Appendix A to this report which contains a statement by the present author on the sanctuary movement as it exists and functions here in Kansas.

Finally, let us note the words of Wichitan Hector Franco written many years ago. Franco was a Mexican, partly raised in that country, and then moved to Kansas. It is fitting to let his wisdom make itself felt again today:

> Mexicans are never united for any definite purpose. We have been in towns where two identical celebrations are held because two rival groups could not unite or work together. We have been in towns where two societies are bitterly opposed to eachother, even though they are "fraternal" organizations. Even in church we find such antagonism that people of different faith will sometimes prefer not to be on speaking terms. This Mexican idiosyncracy has not been fully eradicated either in the United States or in Mexico. (from Hector Franco, The Mexican People in the State of Kansas, Wichita, The University of Wichita Department of Religious Education, Masters Thesis, 1950, pp. 119-120)*

It was noteworthy in conducting the present research that sentiments such as those of Franco were commonly heard from contemporary members of the established Hispanic community, especially where the divisive issue of the IMAs was concerned.

*Emphasis added by Prof. Johnson.

Conclusions. During 1984 and part of 1985, we examined the impact of Spanish-speaking migrants in Wichita largely in terms of their relationships with law enforcement agencies, church-run health clinics, and the public school system. In the sequel to this study we will focus almost entirely on the migrant aliens themselves and will tell their story in depth using both structured questionnaires and extensive personal interviews. Much of this work is already underway and some preliminary reflections are now in order.

We have shown the exact numbers of Hispanics receiving bilingual education and or English as a second language in the public schools of Wichita. Probably a comparable number are receiving ESL training at private contract or church-run facilities. The majority of the adult Spanish-speaking migrant aliens, however, appear not to want to learn English at all (apart from sending their children to school) and are content to employ such rudimentary English as is necessary to sustain one's job and conduct the basic business of one's life. This has many obvious disadvantages which space will not permit listing here, but these include such difficulties as failure to respond to court and government orders simply because of failure to understand. Working out one's problems on-the-job or with landlords is another area where English deficiency is severely felt.

The IMA is often a victim of his cultural unfamiliarity. Thus, a number of unscrupulous attorneys in Wichita have been able to charge illegal aliens high fees under the promise that they would "try to arrange papers" but under circumstances (and we have checked this carefully) in which nothing at all could legally be done for the person being so charged the lawyer's fees. In other cases, attorneys have charged exorbitant fees to fill out papers which government agencies will do nearly free for

the given applicant. So English deficiency has its costs and these the migrants often pay, dearly so.

In the matter of law enforcement, we have only rough estimates provided by the INS as to how many illegal aliens there are in Wichita or in Kansas. The Garden City office of INS states that since it opened in March, 1976, it has processed 8,141 illegal aliens from all parts of the state.[12] Some of these, however, may have been apprehended, thus counted, more than once. We will be working toward a more exact estimate of the illegal alien population in Kansas in the future. But on the basis of the present research, we seriously doubt the often quoted figure by law enforcement agencies that there are between 15 and 25 thousand illegal aliens in Wichita. The average will certainly vary with seasonal labor demands. But on the basis of patient attendance at the Clínica Hispana, it is doubtful that the total of illegal aliens from all Hispanic-sending countries could be greater than 5,000 and it is probably considerably below that figure if averaged out over a year.

The Clinic had some 859 active patients during 1983 and 1984. Medical sociologists estimate that given a reasonable nutritional intake, and in the light of the housing conditions described above (which range from poor to quite good), Wichita's likely needy Spanish-speaking population would have to be some 3,500 in order to generate those 859 patients.[13] The present writer has estimated through the interview process that about 90 percent of the patients at the Hispanic Clinic are technically illegal aliens, although many are in one or another stage of application for legal status. Many illegal alien parents have legal U.S. citizen children. But despite these uncertainties, an estimate of approximately 3,000 illegal aliens in Wichita still seems high but reasonable in 1985.

There is a major assumption underlying this estimate that must be

clarified. It is that nearly all of the migrant Spanish-speaking population has principal, if not exclusive, recourse to the Clínica Hispana. Although there are certainly cases of Spanish-speaking persons who can afford to pay a private doctor, and of needy Hispanics who throw themselves at the last moment onto hospital emergency rooms, the basic fact remains that we can find no other clinic in Wichita which regularly handles needy Spanish-speaking people on the scale of patient intake that is registered by the Clínica Hispana. So I am assuming that the Clinic is where almost all of the needy Hispanics under study go and that about 90% of them are illegal aliens. If my assumption is wrong, then I will correct this population estimate in future research.[14]

A major purpose of this preliminary report is, of course, to invite criticism leading to just such clarifications. Clearly, however, 3,000 illegal aliens is a far cry from the 15 to 25 thousand which law enforcement spokesmen often give as estimates. If there were that many illegals in Wichita, it would surely generate a heavier case intake load than the Clínica Hispana now registers.

Not only are American citizens, their church groups, and United States governmental agencies concerned about the illegal alien presence in Kansas, the Mexican government itself is also concerned about what is happening to its citizens. In a 1985 edition of El Perico, Wichita's monthly bilingual newspaper, the Mexican Consulate in Kansas City, Missouri, took out a large announcement offering help to Mexican citizens who may have fallen victim to one brand of mischief or another, or who should find themselves undocumented and in the category of the IMAs we are continuing to study.[15] Mexican Consul Lic. Rubén Casio Ibarra's message appeared only in Spanish. Providing an English translation is usually the case with most of the key content of El Perico. One might presume that the diplomat's assumption

was that persons unable to read Spanish would not need to know his message. Essentially, the consul stated that the Mexican Consulate was available to help undocumented persons who have been apprehended by the INS, and subsequently, whose employers declined to pay what was due, or in cases of persons admitted to hospitals whose rights might have been violated in one way or another, or that the Consulate could visit and advise Mexican nationals held prisoner in U.S. jails and sometimes arrange to have them released to serve the remainder of their term in Mexican jails near to their families so as to permit visitation.[16]

As principal investigator on this project, I think it only fair to take the Mexican government at its word. However, on several occasions, I have witnessed Mexican citizens residing in Wichita, both with and without legal papers, who attempted to phone their Consulate in Kansas City with the immediate result that the phone at the other end was quickly picked up, not answered, and then rapidly hung up, thereby making telephonic contact impossible. Folklore has it that one must go in person. These frustrated Mexicans told me that such conduct was typical of Mexican consulates throughout the United States. I have no way of assessing the veracity of the charge, but it is believed and repeated by many, and I have been witness to several such cases.

All of this augurs poorly for the feeling of security which the Kansas IMAs might like to achieve. Their government seems not to be responsive to their needs either in Mexico or here. They are living clandestinely in a society whose political machinery is continually being put into motion against them (the Simpson-Mazolli Bill, at least as most Hispanics tend to see it). Landlords and employers are sometimes hostile and exploitive. Favoritism appears to be shown toward refugees from countries of other cultures (Southeast Asia for example). It is difficult for the IMAs to learn English. The

police often appear (rightly or wrongly) abusive. Medical attention is scarce and rumors that the Clínica Hispana might go out of existence in its present form are frightening to the many who have come to depend upon it.[17] If one does need legal help, attorneys and notaries frequently exploit the IMA and if an honest lawyer or paralegal is located, oftentimes there is nothing which can be done. All of the above are stress-creating factors which affect the emotional health, and in cases potentially the physical health, of the Spanish-speaking aliens. Their mental health is surely an important factor in the quality of life which these people share. Yet, mental health as such is almost never a complaint heard formally at the Clínica Hispana nor is the Clinic prepared to offer specialized psychiatric services.

One of the most critical areas of impact which the Wichita urban community has on the migrant Hispanics, then, is creating an atmosphere of anxiety and even anguish in which they must live and function. The present writer suspects this is intimately related to the ostensibly high incidence of interpersonal violence (including that which goes officially unreported), wife and child abuse and neglect which are common (but not necessarily more acute than with the overall population), and alcoholism and alcohol abuse which also seem high among the Hispanic migrants. But these are not observations based on precise statistics; they are simply that, observations, that will be examined and developed in the sequel to this study. Yet many of the needy Hispanics are visibly people in distress, of that there can be no doubt. Church groups have an obvious challenge in all of this which cries out for a response.

One Hispanic medical authority has written that Hispanics generally remain sorely in need of mental health services.[18] He notes that in dealing with these Hispanic needs, mental health professionals frequently discover

that their patients have had occasional or habitual recourse to folk healers. He suggests that contemporary psychotherapists could benefit from some of the skills of the folk healers, saying they "represent a vast untapped resource in a field that is understaffed, and requires large operating budgets and lengthy training periods to overcome language and cultural barriers."[19] It is not my purpose to expand upon the mental health dimensions of the migrant Hispanic experience in this report. But I would stress, however, that this is a promising area of inquiry both for our sequel and for the service planning activities of groups like the Clínica Hispana wherein (and this author can testify to it from over a year of regular service as a volunteer in that clinic) many problems of mental health are presented in the guise of something else.

In one instance, the ability of a person to handle anxiety in his unnatural cultural milieu may be brought to the Clinic as "back pains" or "headaches." Seldom do lower class migrant Hispanics admit they are suffering from emotional distress or in any way admit to mental illness (it is often estimated that 20 percent of the total U.S. population suffers one form of mental illness or another, so one could imagine that the stressful surroundings of living in a clandestine subculture would generate an even higher percentage).[20] In another instance, "a family dispute may be perceived as being caused by some evil influence instead of the emotional problems of a family member."[21] These are very real considerations for migrant Hispanics which affect their quality-of-life circumstances and we will develop these realities and their social implications in the coming months.

Inserting the migrant Spanish-speaking persons into school systems where their U.S.-born brethren are already seen as disadvantaged may heighten friction between the two groups since those with an English dis-

ability acquire a stigma that is transmitted ascriptively to all the U.S. citizen Hispanics in the classroom. It has been noted that in Kansas, the Hispanics tend to have lower educational attainment levels and lower graduation rates than is true for the total population. Persons of 16 to 19 years had a high school drop-out rate of 21.8 percent for Hispanics as compared with 11.3 percent for the overall population.[22]

Adding further to the depressed conditions of life for Hispanic migrants are the working conditions to which I alluded earlier. In a California study, Margo DeLey found that undocumented Mexican women generally worked in less pleasant conditions and for less pay than their legal counterparts.[23] There is reason to believe that the same pattern prevails here in Wichita and throughout Kansas. In that California study, a high degree of reliance on friends and relatives was found among the IMAs during times of distress and public agencies were seldom called upon. That condition further stresses the need for the sort of church-sponsored activities we have seen in Wichita. It is my general impression that, both in Kansas and California, illegal Mexican aliens, especially women, contribute to the profitability of the enterprises which hire them much more than do their documented counterparts or U.S. citizen workers. And most of the IMAs know this to be the case, knowledge they have admitted to this writer and which conditions their feelings of inferiority and second class "citizenship." Again, the public health implications of this circumstance should be obvious.[24]

This study has delineated some of the major impact and integration dimensions of clandestine Hispanic migration in Wichita, Kansas. Principal remaining tasks for the sequel study include developing comparable rural dimensions on a statewide basis and creating a quality-of-life paradigm

which can be applied analytically in the formation of public policies targeted on social betterment goals.

The need for such policies increases as Mexico, the principal migrant "sending" nation, is increasingly unable to care for its starving masses whose northward migration seems only to be growing with no end in sight. Without U.S. federal aid much, if not all, the burden of caring for those needy will fall at the doorstep of private institutions like those we have discussed here in Wichita. The pressure from Mexico is not letting up. One Mexican author recently described his nation's current socio-economic condition as "the toughest economic crisis in the history of contemporary Mexico, caused by a government which during the last twelve years has been impoverishing the people and looting the national economy."[25] One consequence of this is that many of the clandestine migrants who used to come to the U.S. with the intention of returning to their native villages are now abandoning this goal. It is an apparently new and changing behavior pattern that contrasts sharply with established images of Mexican migrants from the Michoacán villages (Acuitzio to use a published example) who saw clandestine migration to the United States as something of a necessary evil. During their absence, the married men may typically prohibit their wives from any type of social circulation (like public sales, employment, etc.) that might lead to expanded social contacts and infidelity. Few migrants in the past have reported profound pleasure over the coming-and-going from villages to the U.S. for survival. One report has it that in Acuitzio "most women and men consider the arrangement to be a necessary evil, dictated by the economic circumstances. Nearly all view the period of migration as temporary, and are increasingly alarmed by the need to return year after year long beyond their original intentions."[26] Now much of the Mexico-to-U.S. migrant stream seems to be

becoming a one way process as more and more people are convinced that life in Mexico is hopeless and that they should put down permanent roots, albeit reluctantly, in places like Wichita.

Thus, it is reported from the village of Napizaro in central Mexico that the people have not only ceased to return but they have stopped sending money back as well. Droves of Mexicans are reported leaving that area under the worst financial conditions in memory.[27] Napizaro, by the way, is near the home location of our Nájera-Galván family here in Wichita. They too express doubts about being ever able to return to the village they love. Financially these people are becoming "stranded" here in Kansas.[28] Perhaps they will take their place along with other permanently stranded Hispanics, like the Puerto Ricans for instance, whose "wide sombreros...are first of all the symbol of the Puerto Rican workers of the hills, the jibaro: symbol of the poverty the people of the island thought they were leaving behind and were ashamed of and found in a different form in New York City."[29] The choice seems to be between starvation or migration.

These are great human dramas, many of them highly traumatic yet some ultimately rewarding. In the process America is enriched with new blood. But the question is, how long can we absorb these people in Wichita or about the Great Plains and still maintain the quality of life we want for everyone else? Already it is common to hear Los Angeles referred to as the second largest Mexican city in the world. Some Mexicans comment wryly that what their nation lost to the U.S. by military conquest in 1848 they will retake slowly but progressively by clandestine migration. This poses enormous social policy problems for the United States given the interdependency between the Mexican and American economies. The sequel to this study, by focusing on the clandestine migrants themselves, will

estimate the degree of interdependency between the two nations and the role, and the fate, of states like Kansas in the outcome of that dynamic process.

****

Note: studies are now emerging as to the public service impact of illegal immigration to the United States. The State of Texas estimates that its costs of educating illegal alien children are born 48 percent by the state, 40 percent by the localities, and the small remainder from the federal government. The Texas case demonstrated that state revenues generated by illegal aliens far exceeded the cost of the services those people required, but that local revenues fell substantially short of those costs. We assume from the data in this study that a similar situation prevails in Wichita and in Kansas, but that remains to be tested systematically. There seems to be a consensus among other scholars of immigration that the federal government takes in more money from the illegal aliens than it loses. This also merits further testing. See The Use of Public Services by Undocumented Aliens in Texas, Austin, Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, policy research report # 60, pp. 67, 70, 74, and page xxx. This report was published in 1984 by the University of Texas.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

1. Interviews by Donna Burger, April 5, 1985.

2. Compare this observation with others made of IMAs occupying substandard housing in Los Angeles, for instance W. Tim Dagodag, "Illegal Mexican Aliens in Los Angeles: Locational Characteristics," in Richard C. Jones ed., Patterns of Undocumented Migration: Mexico and the United States, Totowa, New Jersey, Rowman and Allanheld Publishers, 1984, pp. 199-217, passim.

3. Cf. Kenneth F. Johnson, Mexican Democracy: A Critical View, New York, Praeger, 1984, pp. 217-224.

4. The Wichita Eagle-Beacon, February 9, 1985.

5. Undated press release received during 1984 signed by Kathy Ketchum and George Clement.

6. Letter to Prof. Johnson from George Clement, Chief Benefit Payment Control of the Kansas Department of Human Resources dated October 26, 1984. As noted in the text, the present author has evidence that illegal aliens can receive unemployment benefits for a time. The question raised here is the veracity of the agency press release in question and the use of IMAs as punitive targets therein.

7. Letter to Prof. Johnson from George Doyle, February 25, 1985.

8. Letter to Prof. Johnson from Bernice Hutcherson, March 21, 1985

9. Various communications and final memo of understanding between K.F. Johnson and Maria Balderas, April 18, 1985.

10. Letter from Kimberly A. Johnston to Prof. Johnson, April 23, 1985.

11. Letter from Rev. James M. Bell to Prof. Johnson, May 1, 1985.

12. Interviews by Phil Alldritt, January 16, 1985.

13. These calculations are based on interviews by K.F. Johnson with Professor Nancy Brooks of the Department of Sociology at WSU. This methodology requires additional refinement in the sequel as she has generously recommended.

14. Ibid.

15. El Perico (Wichita), April, 1985, front page.

16. Ibid.

17. Were the Hispanic Clinic to end at the end of 1985 because of the sale of the Wesley Medical Center to a private corporation it is not clear whether a way could be found to care for illegal alien patients at other clinics for the indigent which use public funds; that is the principal issue!

18. Melvin Delgado, "Therapy Latino Style: Implications for Psychiatric Care," in Perspectives in Psychiatric Care, Vol. XVII, May-June, No.3, 1979, pp. 107-113.

19. Ibid., p. 107.

20. Ibid. Also interviews with Prof. Nancy Brooks cited above.

21. Ibid., p. 109.

22. KACMAA, Education Profile of Kansas Hispanics, Topeka, Kansas Advisory Commission on Mexican American Affairs, 1984, p. 1.

23. Margo DeLey, "The Employment Experience of Undocumented Mexican Women in Los Angeles: Results of a New Survey," a paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Chicano Studies, Austin, Texas, March, 1984, p. 8.

24. Ibid. Plus observations in Wichita, Kansas. See also Alisse Waterson, Perspectives on Westchester: A Case Study of the Hispanic Community in New Rochelle, New York City, City University of New York Graduate Center, 1985, passim.

25. Victor Manuel Cuevas, El fracaso de Miguel de la Madrid ante la crisis, Mexico, EDAMEX, 1985, p. 7.

26. Raymond E. Wiest, "External Dependency and the Perpetuation of Temporary Migration to the United States," in Richard C. Jones ed. op. cit., p. 119.

27. George Getshow writing in The Wall Street Journal, May 1, 1985.

28. See Johnson, Mexican Democracy: A Critical View, op. cit., p. 217.

29. Dan Wakefield, Island in the City, New York, Corinth Books Inc., 1957, p. 259

EPILOGUE*

*The writer, Tom L. Page, is a native Wichitan, a published writer-poet, and holds the Master of Fine Arts degree from Wichita State University. He has also lived and studied extensively in Latin America.

Professor Kenneth Johnson's study of Wichita's Hispanic-American community is striking in several respects. To my knowledge it is the only study of the Hispanic community, and we can take pride in the fact that a scholar of Professor Johnson's background and reputation chose Wichita as the site of his research. The section, "Prominent Wichita Hispanics: A Social and Attitudinal Profile", is especially interesting. The results of this survey are tentative and the reputational method of studying community power structure carries with it several well-known limitations and risks. The responses of the thirty-one community leaders in the sample do indicate an identification with the city at large and perhaps with social class, rather than with any putative ethnic identity.

While I in no way intend to celebrate any jingoistic version of "Kansasism," my reading of Kansas cultural history leads me to believe that personal identification with the general population of Kansas and with the state as a concept is a widely held attitude. I understand that Kansas has been a melting pot since before the Civil War. The history of my family attests to that fact. This feeling is conveyed by Kenneth Porter in a stanza of his poem, "Harvest: June, 1938":

> Half-waking in the day coach east from Denver
> an elevator named the town. A month
> before my low-keyed mind might momently
> have drifted down associative pathways:
> "...Sicilian City, Athen's great misfortune....
> town in New York where I once spent a month
> slapping the dust from documents century-old..."
> as well, of course, as: "...western Kansas village--
> home of the negro who answered the instructor's compliments
> on his Spanish accent by reference to the doubly
> fortunate presence in town of a Mexican barber...."

The study has a section on the recent history of Wichita's Hispanic community-police relations; in it the tensions between members of the Wichita Police Department and Hispanics are described, as are attempts to improve Hispanic-police relations. This work is valuable because it establishes a public record of events that is difficult to ignore. It is a document that can be read by members of the Wichita Police Department and by officials of other agencies as part of their training in police-community relations in the area of dominant culture-subculture contact.

One last word. What will be the fate of the illegals, not only those from Mexico, but also those unfortunate people who have fled the genocidal policies of many of the Central American governments? It's likely that Professor Johnson's

study will become a document of major importance in the debate over policy regarding the refugees. I hope Wichita will take a leadership role in welcoming this latest wave of victims of oppression to our land, to this Nation of Immigrants.

Tom L. Page
Wichita, Kansas
May, 1985

APPENDIX A

A NOTE ON CENTRAL AMERICAN REFUGEES AND THE SANCTUARY MOVEMENT

Concordia is located in north-central Kansas, a city with about 7,000 inhabitants, mostly of European stock. It is not the sort of place one would normally expect to find singled out as "the promised land" for a handful of Central American refugees from Guatemala, a number of whom don't even speak Spanish. All of their native tongues are one or another of the many dialects which subdivide Guatemala's Quiche-Mayan culture. At the moment of this writing about 30 Guatemalans have been given politico-religious sanctuary in a Catholic convent in Concordia known as the Manna House of Prayer. It is run by the Sisters of St. Joseph. In April, 1983, the Sisters of St. Joseph decided to join a growing national sanctuary movement that was formed one year earlier in Tucson, Arizona, by the Reverend John Fife, a Presbyterian minister, and Jim Corbett, a Quaker elder. Fife and Corbett announced their decision publicly to the media by sharing a letter they directed to U.S. Attorney General William French Smith. The letter stated that Fife's congregation would begin deliberately violating immigration and refugee law on behalf of those fleeing the U.S.-financed war and genocide in Central America. It also accused the federal government itself of acting in violation of the Refugee Act of 1980.[1]

The nuns at Concordia were inspired to join the sanctuary movement partly because of encouragement they received from Mennonite Church groups in Newton, Kansas. Nationwide, the Mennonites have become highly visible in their activities on behalf of the Central American refugees. At the moment of this writing there are some 170 churches and Jewish congregations which have joined the movement. Coordination of the movement is

divided between the Tucson Ecumenical Council and the Chicago Religious Task Force on Central America.[2] In addition to those churches which have formally declared sanctuary there are a multitude of others that have assumed supporting roles. For instance, in McPherson, Kansas, the First Congregational Church of Christ held a display of paintings done by Salvadoran refugee children that was intended to raise money for the Sisters of St. Joseph at Concordia to promote their work with the refugees. Such religious labor is now being termed sanctuary ministry. The display at the McPherson Church of Christ was provided by OXFAM, an international relief organization centered in Boston, Massachussetts. The drawings were made by young children who had been asked to depict life in the home villages they had fled. "One example depicts soldiers and a helicopter crew spraying machine-gun fire into a house. A dismembered child is lying on the ground and others are shown hiding in a cornfield."[3] This exemplifies the horror that drives the Central Americans north into Mexico and ultimately to the United States. It demonstrates that the sanctuary movement, which since 1982 has formed to protect the refugees, is truly ecumenical in character. It has had a major impact on religious congregations and peace groups here in Kansas and throughout the nation as well.

Whereas the service functions provided to economic refugees from Mexico (Chapter 3) in Wichita are medical, social, and religious in character the sanctuary movement takes on an additional distinctively political character vis a vis the Central American refugees. It should be clearly understood that economic refugees from Mexico are not being embraced by the sanctuary movement.

Several considerations must be understood about the Central American refugees which will distinguish their case from that of the IMAs (illegal Mexican aliens) whose impact in Wichita commands the bulk of the attention

in this report. In the first place, there is a basis for claiming that the refugees are not illegal aliens since they have fled persecution in their native lands. The Refugee Act of 1980 states quite clearly that a refugee is a person who cannot return to his homeland because of "persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion."[4] The United States government has discretion in deciding who is a political refugee under this legal stricture. It is the current practice of the U.S. government to deny political refugee status to Guatemalans and Salvadorans in about 99 percent of the cases. U.S. aid supports the governments of both those countries and to accept refugees from there would be a public admission that we support repressive and genocidal (in the case of Guatemala) regimes. But almost anyone from Cuba, Poland, or Czeckoslovakia will be granted political asylum almost automatically in the U.S., and the difference between how Salvadoran and Polish refugees are treated by the U.S. government has been studied. A major FRONTLINE program on PBS was devoted to such a comparison several years ago. It dramatized quite convincingly the politicized nature of U.S. governmental decision-making in admitting refugees from Central America as opposed to those from the Communist bloc of nations.[5]

Because of the foregoing, the sanctuary workers believe that ultimately they can win either in court or in Congress against the federal government and that if they must undergo incarceration to force the government to comply with the law, or to force Congress to amend the law, then it will be worth it. Several sanctuary workers have been prosecuted and convicted as of this writing for transporting and harboring illegal aliens (the defendants, of course, are appealing on the grounds that they were transporting bona fide political refugees, not illegal aliens, and therefore

not in violation of the law). There is also legislation pending in Congress which would specifically recognize Central Americans as political refugees. This comes in response to a number of questionable tactics used by the U.S. government including wiretapping, infiltrating churches with recording devices, planting spies in the sanctuary movement, and alleged illegal breaking and entering to gain access to files belonging to sanctuary ministers, priests, nuns, and lay workers.[6] It has also been documented by an Episcopal clergyman that the U.S. government is using (abusing?) the federal grand jury process to harrass and even imprison persons associated with the sanctuary movement who cannot be prosecuted under the immigration laws simply because the government lacks an adequate case.[7] All of this raises a number of rather scary Orwellian questions about the status of First Ammendment rights of speech and religion in this country vis a vis the sanctuary movement as it is now being treated by the Reagan Administration.

In the second place it has been abundantly documented by non-governmental organizations like Amnesty International, the International Red Cross, and the Catholic Relief Services that persons who are deported to Guatemala and El Salvador will most likely be imprisoned, tortured, and even killed by those governments. No such tragedies await the IMAs who are put across the Mexican border. Their worst fate is trouble in feeding themselves while they await another chance at clandestine migration north. Thus, when Central Americans are apprehended by the INS, it is well worth their while to try to convince the U.S. authorities that they are Mexicans so as to be deported there rather than to Guatemala or El Salvador. This does not always work, I am told on good authority, as the INS has ways of distinguishing nationality.

In the third place the Central American refugees do not have established foothold support groups waiting for them in the U.S. as do the Mexicans who have established such migrational bases for themselves since the early part of the twentieth century. And given the fact that many Guatemalans do not even speak Spanish, they, in particular, will have a harder time adapting to life as transplants into a strange culture. The Central Americans from Guatemala and El Salvador who are political refugees almost entirely prefer to return to their villages; but since many of these have been burned, and since war and genocide show no signs of letting up, these people are fearfully stranded and with fewer recourse options than the IMAs enjoy. That is why the sanctuary movement is so important politically. It seeks principally to challenge the U.S. foreign policy of aiding specifically the governments of Guatemala and El Salvador which would surely fall without U.S. support, thereby, presumably, allowing the refugees to eventually return home. So the sanctuary movement here in Kansas and elsewhere should not be understood as an effort to merely absorb all the Central American refugees, a task that would clearly be impossible. The goal is quite clearly to harbor a few refugees through the granting of politico-religious santuary and then to use this gesture of non-violent civil disobedience as a challenge to the U.S. government through the courts and the Congress to either change the law or else change the way it is administered, or both. Some success has been forthcoming, a topic to which I will return briefly below.

In the fourth place the refugees who get placed in the sanctuary movement and distributed about the country via an "underground railroad" of religious and lay workers are not kept "low profile" or in hiding as the illegal Mexican aliens usually do. The refugees in sanctuary appear

publicly for selected media events, usually wearing masks so that their identities will not be made known to the governments they have fled, which would almost certainly take reprisals against friends and relatives remaining in those countries. There are many examples of such public showings of the Central American refugees. The Wichita Eagle-Beacon did a front page cover story on February 16, 1985, of the refugees at Concordia, Kansas. The same refugees in Kansas had earlier been publicized in Arizona by the Tucson Citizen on September 30, 1983, and by The Arizona Republic on August 26, 1984. The FRONTLINE program on PBS (previously cited) also dealt with the Kansas refugees.

Press coverage on the sanctuary movement has been extensive throughout the country. The National Catholic Reporter carried a front page story on April 6, 1984, about the decision by the monks at the Weston Benedictine Priory of Weston, Vermont, to grant sanctuary to several Guatemalan refugee families. This story was carried by other national news media. Witness:

> Bells rang out through the crisp southern Vermont air March 24 signaling the arrival of the Freedom Caravan carrying Guatemalan Indian refugees. Five hundred supporters cheered when the 19-vehicle procession, some cars sporting "Jesus was a refugee" bumper stickers, crested the mountainous Vermont road. . . the Benedictine priory was the 100th site to declare itself a public sanctuary for Central American refugees fleeing war in their homelands.[8]

On the issue of how many sanctuaries exist, when the present author was invited to deliver a major lecture on the sanctuary movement at an Alabama college in April of 1985, he casually remarked that according to January 1985 figures there were somewhere between 150 and 170 formally declared religious sanctuaries in the U.S., but that apparently none existed in the state of Alabama. At this point a man rose in the audience, identified himself as a Lutheran minister, and announced that his congregation was then actively talking sanctuary.[9] So there is clearly no effort made by the

sanctuary movement to hide the refugees from public view. The politics of the effort, to the contrary, depend upon such publicity so as to challenge the government. Sanctuary vis a vis the development of American politics is beyond the scope of this report, but I will be developing it more fully in a separate treatise.

Finally, in the fifth place, the cause of the Central American refugees has produced a number of unexpected cross-cutting alliances and has created political and religious divisions that can be observed nationally as well as here in Kansas. National attention was attracted by the conversion to sanctuary of William Clarke, a distinguished business executive in Canton, Ohio, who became an admitted conspirator on behalf of Central American refugees. As carried by The Wall Street Journal on June 21, 1984, Clarke was inspired by the example of sanctuary founder Rev. John Fife of Tuscon, Arizona, and began visiting local churches to speak on behalf of sanctuary:

> Mr. Clark always starts his speech the same way. . ."I'm a Republican, very conservative. I voted for Ronald Reagan. So I'm the last person in the world to be advocating civil disobedience." But by the end of this speech about El Salvador, Guatemala, and U.S. immigration policy, that is precisely what he does.[10]

Such reports undoubtedly concern the federal government as dedication to a higher moral order increasingly makes conservative "law-and-order" citizens into devotees of civil disobedience, at least in relation to U.S. policy in Central America.

A few other examples of defiant sanctuary ministry deserve mention to set forth the severity of the issue and poignancy of feeling it has engendered among a vast cross section of Americans. Quakers in Corpus Christi, Texas, proclaimed sanctuary in an especially daring way. Instead of using a church, where some First Ammendment religious protections might be invoked, they opted for a downtown store front which surely raised

the public visibility of their action.[11] Catholics in the same city defied their local bishop, himself an Hispanic, and circulated petitions in favor of the pending Moakley-DiConcini Bill that would grant temporary extended voluntary departure status (i.e. safe-haven) to Central American refugees in the United States until it would be safe for them to return home.[12]

On April 18, 1984, a parade of Central American refugees marched publicly, and with prior notice to the media, from the Southside Presbyterian Church in Tucson, Arizona, to a Freedom Center established at Temple Emanu-El, a reformed Jewish congregation. There a religious vigil was celebrated by Protestant and Jewish clergymen and rabbis in support of Catholic lay worker Jack Elder, a sanctuary activist who had just been indicted in Texas for "transporting illegal aliens" in the course of his own practice of sanctuary ministry. Elder, who has since been sentenced to one year in prison, is co-director of the Casa Oscar Romero that is funded and operated by the Diocese of Brownsville, Texas, and which enjoys other ecumenical support. Casa Romero provides food, shelter, and other assistance to Central American refugees and is named for the former Archbishop of El Salvador who was murdered by right wing death squads in his church while saying mass. The above demonstrations of solidarity among Protestants, Catholics, and Jews in defense of Casa Romero dramatize the growing ecumenical support for the sanctuary movement here in the United States as well as public opposition to U.S. financing of political repression in those countries.[13] Nationwide there is a legion of religious groups including Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish congregations which support the sanctuary movement. Access to that information is readily available to the interested reader.[14]

Here in Kansas an outpouring of sentiment in favor of the refugee sanctuary at Concordia is convincing proof that the sanctuary hosts and their refugee guests are having a religious and political impact in this Great Plains area. Several examples will suffice to dramatize this. One major newspaper in the state which might be regarded as traditional or conservative, The Salina Journal, editorialized in favor of "noble nuns" of Concordia as follows:

> One has to admire Concordia's Sisters of St. Joseph for their decision to give sanctuary to refugees fleeing the bloody turmoil of Central America.
>
> Because these refugees are considered illegal aliens by the federal government, the Roman Catholic nuns risk legal troubles. The nuns know that. They plan to help the refugees anyway.
>
> Certainly the federal government must have controls on aliens. National borders can't be wide-open doors. But refugees from countries torn by political terror and bloodshed should be allowed in. The people the nuns plan to aid, or have already aided, are in this category.
>
> These refugees come from El Salvador and Guatemala. Right-wing death squads have made political murder an everyday affair in El Salvador. In Guatemala, General Rios Montt's army is notorious for its massacres of unarmed civilians.
>
> Despite these horrors, the State Department writes off those who flee this madness as no different from other aliens.
>
> Clearly the Concordia nuns are doing nothing wrong. What is wrong is the U.S. government's policy toward refugees from Central America. A 1980 law allows political asylum for aliens who fear persecution in their homelands. Why are refugees from El Salvador and Guatemala excluded from this protection?
>
> Washington should re-examine its refugee policies. The nuns of Concordia should be left free to do their good work.[15]

On March 31, 1985, the Sisters of St. Joseph at Concordia hosted an "open house" at which the public was invited to meet their Guatemalan refugee families then totaling some 30 persons. Several Guatemalan men gave testimony through an interpreter as to how they had been forced to flee their country, some threatened by the anti-government insurgents and others persecuted by the Guatemalan army. A repeated theme was: "We don't know or care about communism or capitalism, we never knew where the USSR was nor the USA for that matter. We now know about America and are grateful for our lives and this sanctuary here in

Kansas. What we don't understand is why President Reagan wants to send guns to the Guatemalan military to kill us with. Why doesn't he send us directly some farm machinery, seeds, and fertilizer. That is what we need. Why does our country's army have to persecute us? After all we only want to live in our villages and worship our gods, have our women weave cloth, and let us feed them and our children. Why should there be war in Guatemala? We didn't start it. We were there first and the foreigners came to push us off our lands."[16]

At the same March 1985 "open house" at the sanctuary in Concordia, Kansas, a representative of the Mennonite Central Committee of Washington, D.C., spoke and distributed a document in support of the Sisters of St. Joseph. It is an appeal to persons of good faith to ask their senators and congressmen to vote "no" on the pending legislation that would provide some 35 million dollars to the government of Guatemala, regardless of the well-documented fact that it is massacring its Indian population. The document contained testimony from the Catholic-sponsored Guatemalan Human Rights Commission, located in Mexico City, as to the atrocities committed by Guatamala's army against Indians during 1985 alone.[17] Another speaker at the "open house" meeting speculated as to how such funds might be used to bail out the hundreds of Kansas farmers then going bankrupt rather than financing a genocidal government that is generating more corpses and more refugees.

As might be expected in Kansas, as elsewhere, the sanctuary movement has not gotten unlimited and spontaneous support from all religious groups. The Roman Catholic bishop of Wichita is generally believed to oppose the sanctuary effort in Concordia, although he has not made it into a major public issue. While other orders of nuns in the Wichita area do give support to the Concordia group, there are some Catholic clergy who

quite positively disapprove on the grounds that the Concordia experiment is both law-breaking and unethical politiking by religious people. Although the United Methodist Urban Ministries of Wichita provide medical help and counselling for all Spanish-speaking indigent people, there are also some Methodists who feel the whole relief enterprise, whether for Mexicans or Central Americans, is improper and should be ended. Majority active religious sentiment seems, however, at least tolerant if not outright sympathetic with the sanctuary ministry. Many see the story of Christ himself as symbolically reinacted in the sanctuary ministry and in the lives of the refugees.

An important local sanctuary activist, Dick Williams, delivered a sermon on sanctuary before an Episcopal congregation in 1983, one which severely divided that church's membership.[18] The sermon Williams presented is an impressive politico-religious statement and cites both the theological and social bases for granting sanctuary. It tells of Guatemalan peasants fleeing their villages while soldiers dressed in U.S. Army style uniforms and flying U.S.-built helicopters fired down on women, children, even babies. One of the children who was born during that fire-fight was Veronica who is now growing up with the Sisters of St. Joseph at Concordia. Her survival was a miracle of major proportions. Williams cited the extensive documentation of the Guatemalan atrocities as a pattern, relying heavily on the writings of Penny Lernoux. He urged the congregation to read her account.[19]

He also pointed to the contradictory ideological tendency among North Americans, citing the case of his own grandfather, to be charitable and caring at home while contributing financially to unspeakable atrocities in other lands. Why, queried Williams, are Americans willing to see their

tax dollars used to commit atrocities overseas which would never be permitted to occur inside this country? He cited a parallel with the German people who somehow were able to do to the Jews what they would presumably never tolerate being done to themselves. Williams concluded that through joining the sanctuary movement his church could reach out for the good life and help deliver its blessing to the people of Guatemala:

> Imagine for a moment the world as you would like it to be--loving relationships, laughing children, hard work, goals achieved in trust and confidence, beautiful music, moments of prayer and thanksgiving. Now reach out and claim that promise. If we care enough, and step out in faith, we can claim the promise of peace.[20]

While supported by many in his church, the majority of William's congregation did not, despite citations from Episcopal bishops supporting the principal of civil disobedience against unjust laws. The congregation rejected the proposal to go sanctuary. And there have been other religious conflicts over sanctuary here in Wichita, about Kansas, and throughout America.

It is a divisive issue both religiously and politically. Recently entire cities have entered the fray, i.e. the city councils of Berkeley, California and Cambridge, Massachusetts, declared that sanctuary for the Central American refugee victims would be available generally within their corporate municipal boundaries and that those municipalities would not cooperate with federal government efforts to apprehend the refugees. Among the sanctuary ministry workers themselves a strength of commitment seems to be growing as of this writing in the spring of 1985; this is likely to continue so long as U.S. aid is financing genocide, ethnocide, and thereby generating refugees fleeing Central America. These victimized people, who have done us no wrong here in the United States, will simply be added to the pool of human resources floating about Kansas and the Great Plains, hoping that church organizations will respond to their plight,

and praying that one day peace, security, and legitimacy will come their way![21]

****

Footnotes

1. Rev. John M. Fife to Attorney General William French Smith, March 23, 1982; copies to U.S. attorney for Arizona and station chief of the Tucson sector U.S. Border Patrol.

2. The Tucson Ecumenical Council is at 317 West 23rd St., Tucson, Arizona, 85713. The Chicago Religious Task Force can be reached at either 407 S. Dearborn St. Room 370, Chicago, Ill. 60605 or at 434 S. Wabash Ave. Room 700, Chicago, Ill. 60605.

3. The Wichita Eagle-Beacon, April 2, 1985.

4. Cited from United States Code: Congressional and Administrative News, 96th Congress Second Session, 1980, Vol. 1, Public Laws 96-188 to 96-460, 94 stat. 102.

5. FRONTLINE, PBS telecast July 11, 1983. FRONTLINE has since done a major four-part series on Central America which aired between April 9 and 12, 1985.

6. Chicago Religious Task Force on Central America document mailed February 7, 1985 and in author's possession.

7. See Richard W. Gillett, "Jailing Grand-Jury Resisters: Implications for Church Activists," The Christian Century, September 26, 1984.

8. National Catholic Reporter, April 6, 1984.

9. Kenneth F. Johnson, "Refugees, Peace Churches, and the Politics of Sanctuary," an honors address presented at Spring Hill College, Mobile, Alabama on April 9, 1985.

10. The Wall Street Journal, June 21, 1984.

11. Corpus Christi Caller, January 29, 1985.

12. Document circulated by Witness for Peace, 326 Merrill Drive, Corpus Christi, Texas 78408.

13. Chicago Religious Task Force document National Sanctuary Mailing, May, 1984, p. 3.

14. Footnotes 3, 12 above contain key addresses for information on the sanctuary movement. Additional information on non-sanctuary aid to needy Hispanics can be had from Center of the Americas, 3037 Dauphine St. (P.O. Box 8602), New Orleans, Louisiana, 70182, and also from United Methodist Hispanic Ministries, 1356 N. Broadway, Wichita, Kansas 67214.

15. The Salina Journal, editorial, April 21, 1983. One legal analyst has recently pointed out that the U.S. Immigration Service has been unfair in its excessive demands of proof that Central American refugees are, indeed, subject to persecution. Martha F. Davis also cites a recent Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals decision over-

turning one such unfair INS rejection of a Salvadoran's asylum petition. From The Wall Street Journal as reprinted in The Wichita Eagle-Beacon, March 17, 1985.

16. Oral testimony from the author's notes, March 31, 1985 at Concordia, Kansas.

17. Mennonite Central Committee: Peace Section, 100 Maryland Ave., N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002, handbill dated March 12, 1985.

18. Dick Williams, Sanctuary, a sermon delivered at St. Alban's Episcopal Church on December 4, 1983 and distributed by photocopy thereafter.

19. Ibid.

20. Ibid., p. 10.

21. Admittedly, this presentation is favorable to the sanctuary movement and responsibility for the content lies with Prof. K.F. Johnson. It should not be implied that any of Prof. Johnson's colleagues agree necessarily with his interpretation. A strongly anti-sanctuary view can be found in the April 16, 1985 editorial of The Wall Street Journal. Interestingly enough, that publication carried a number of investigative reports tending to be favorable to the sanctuary movement and several of these were cited above.